DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 474 EA 002 610

TITLE	Metropolitan School District Cooperation.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Educational Administration.
Pub Date	Jun 69
Note	151p.; Prepared by members of the 1968-1969 Practicum in Educational Administration.
Available from	Center for Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210 ($2.00)
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors	Bibliographies, City Problems, City Wide Programs, Community Agencies (Public), Community Surveys, Educational Problems, Experimental Programs, Federal Programs, *Interagency Cooperation, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Metropolitan Areas, Program Coordination, Program Evaluation, *School Community Cooperation, School Role, Social Change, *Urban Schools

Abstract

This monograph is the culmination of a practicum in educational administration by graduate students of Ohio State University for the academic year 1968-1969. It focuses on various aspects of interagency and interschool district cooperation within the metropolitan setting. After a review of relevant literature in these two areas, a survey of cooperative projects in nine Ohio Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) is presented. Five field reports developed from more intensive investigation of selected projects include (1) the development of a Model Cities project, (2) public school and social agency relationships, (3) community-wide vocational planning, (4) the community school, and (5) cooperative working relationships between public and parochial schools. The monograph concludes with summarizing statements relating its parts. A 116-entry bibliography is appended. (DE)

ED033474

METROPOLITAN
SCHOOL DISTRICT COOPERATION

Prepared By
Members of the 1968-1969 Practicum
in Educational Administration

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Roy Larmee, Chairman TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Center for Educational Administration
College of Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
43210

EA 002 610

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Copyright, June, 1969. Center for Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 43210. Additional copies are available for $2.00 each from the Center.

Members of the Practicum in Educational Administration
1968-1969

John Babel, Jr.
Teacher of Vocational Agriculture
Schoharie, New York

Bruce M. Barlow
Coordinator of Transportation
Grove City, Ohio

John A. Blough
Assistant Superintendent
Orange Local School District
Cleveland, Ohio

Robert Fisher
Principal
Wilson Hill Elementary School
Worthington, Ohio

Harold W. Horton
Instructional Supervisor
Chicago, Illinois

Michael H. Kean
Editor, Strategies for Educational Change (SEC) Newsletter
The Ohio State University

Mark A. Krabbe
English Department Chairman
Canton, Ohio

Charles E. Lundy
Principal
Groves High School
Birmingham, Michigan

H. James Mahan
Principal
Kilbourne Middle School
Worthington, Ohio

Richard E. Miller
Coordinator of Social Studies
Upper Arlington, Ohio

Roger D. Phillips
Teacher of Physics
Charleston, West Virginia

Robert A. Sabatino
Principal
Ursuline High School
Youngstown, Ohio

Mark H. Smith, Jr.
Principal
Cortland Elementary School
Highland Park, Michigan

Vernon J. Snelgrove
Supervising Principal
Labrador City, Canada

William D. Staats
Teacher of English
Columbus, Ohio

George VanderWeyden, Jr.
Chairman
Foreign Language Department
Flossmoor, Illinois

Harry J. Williams, Jr.
Principal
Cadiz High School
Cadiz, Ohio

Orville L. Yoder
Principal
York Elementary School
Middlebury, Indiana

FOREWORD

In this monograph the students enrolled in the 1968-1969 practicum in educational administration have attempted to bring reality into their classroom through the utilization of the State of Ohio as a learning laboratory. Until recently the subject of metropolitanism has received relatively little attention in educational circles. With metropolitan areas as the focus of their study, these students examined the literature as it relates to inter-agency and inter-school cooperation in metropolitan areas. Utilizing this literature review, they designed and carried forward a study of the status of inter-agency and inter-school cooperative efforts in nine Ohio Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

While this monograph does not purport to be a final or exhaustive report or survey of cooperative efforts in metropolitan areas, it is our hope that it will prove useful to students of education. We are assured the project has provided a meaningful learning experience for all those associated with it.

Roy A. Larmee
Hugh D. Laughlin
Raphael Nystrand

Instructors of 1968-1969
Practicum in Educational
Administration

PREFACE

Graduate students of the Ohio State University in the area of educational administration chose to undertake an on-going project in the study of metropolitanism throughout the academic year, 1968-1969. This study was channeled through a practicum experience which is required of all students seeking the doctoral degree in educational administration. The culmination of the practicum has traditionally been the development of a written presentation. This monograph is the 1968-69 Practicum's product, and represents over 3000 hours of work by students and professors.

The monograph focuses on various aspects of inter-agency and inter-school district cooperation within the metropolitan setting. After a review of relevant literature in these two areas, a survey of cooperative projects in the nine Ohio Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) is presented. Five field reports developed from more intensive investigation of selected projects help to focus in on the "state of metropolitan cooperation" in Ohio. The study concludes with summarizing statements relating all three areas.

The members of the practicum extend their thanks to those individuals who contributed information for the on-going projects in their respective communities and also to Professors Roy A. Larmee, Hugh D. Laughlin, and Raphael O. Nystrand for their assistance and direction throughout the conceptualization, implementation, and publication of this report. Gratitude is also expressed to Mr. James Klepser of the Council of Educational Facility Planners for the cover design, and to Mrs. Harriet Ferrell of the University Council for Educational Administration for her technical assistance in producing the manuscript.

CONTENTS

Page

Foreword v

Preface vii

I Introduction 1

II Metropolitan Area Cooperative Efforts 5

III A Survey of Metropolitan Cooperation in Ohio 54

IV Five Exemplary Programs 69

V Some Concluding Comments 129

Bibliography 134

Tomorrow's school will be a school without walls--a school built of doors which open to the entire community.

Tomorrow's school will reach out to the places that enrich the human spirit--to the museums, the theatres, the art galleries, to the parks and rivers and mountains.

It will ally itself with the city, its busy streets and factories, its assembly lines and laboratories--so that the world of work does not seem an alien place for the student.

Tomorrow's schools will be the center of community life, for grownups as well as children--"a shopping center of human services."[1]

--Lyndon Baines Johnson--

---

[1] Lyndon B. Johnson, Address to the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 16, 1966.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The city of the twentieth century may possibly be one of man's greatest achievements, comparable with such accomplishments as space travel and the hydrogen bomb. No one knows with certainty when man initially decided to become a part of the denser and more constricted environment of the city or why he felt compelled to make this move. Some historians view the city as an advanced achievement of social evolution, in that once man had proceeded beyond a purely pastoral existence and was better able to control his environment, he was then ready to build cities. It is further suggested that cities have occupied a dominant position in the Western world and have functioned like magnets in attracting people to a variety of new activities and opportunities.[2]

Recently, however, because of the rapid rate of urban growth, the vocabulary used in describing the metropolis has become pejorative. One is pressed to quickly think of positive terms to balance those presently heard applied to big cities: jungle, sprawl, rape, riot, slum, ghetto, pollution, disease, congestion, filth, strike, blight, and alienation. Few persons dispute that the cities have problems. Many feel that the cities are in deep trouble, with some saying that cities generally are at the brink of crisis. The mayor of that city which should be the proudest physical monument to the world's greatest urban culture, has wondered aloud if the plight of his city is not already past the point of solution. "The question now," New York's John Lindsay has remarked, "is whether we can continue to survive as a city."[3]

---

[2] Leonard Reissman, The Urban Process (New York: The Free Press, 1964), p. 1.

The population of the United States is increasingly being telescoped into core cities and neighboring suburbs. Geographically, metropolitan areas, defined as Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) by the census bureau, occupy less than ten percent of the total land of the United States.[4] As of 1960, more than half of the population of the United States lived in one of the 212 SMSA's. By 1980, the United States will have a population of about 260 million people, with approximately three-fourths of this number residing in metropolitan areas.[5]

The core city is faced with a welter of social problems which have developed partly as a result of the mobility of large segments of the middle and lower classes. The decentralization of business and commerce, the loss of capable leadership, the ever creeping blight, and tax evaluation losses have also contributed to emasculate the once dynamic urban centers. Slums and the negative conditions associated with them rush in to fill the vacuum created by the retreating white population. Urban renewal appears to be fighting a losing battle against decay. The city is hampered by the lack of adequate funds to meet rising operational costs, yet it has to compete with outlying independent communities for tax resources. Social agencies are overwhelmed by the number of cases of the unemployed and the unemployable, the poor who are displaced by slum clearance, the ever rising crime rates and welfare roles, the marginal and alienated who have little identity or dignity, and the general imcompetence and lack of concern by those who maintain control of the urban setting.

---

[3] "John Lindsay's Ten Plagues," Time, November 1, 1968, p. 20.

[4] Robert J. Havighurst, "Introduction," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, The 67th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: The Society, 1968), p. 5.

[5] Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Government Structure, Organization and Planning in Metropolitan Areas (Washington, D.C., The Commission, 1967), p. 7.

These problems are not unique to the core city and have begun to permeate the boundaries imposed previously by the suburbs.

Public education in large metropolitan areas is not isolated from the complexities of urban life. Tremendous sociological, political, economic, and psychological forces identified with the urban areas account for many of the dilemmas of public education. Among the problems that the city school system faces in educating the young are: old and overcrowded schools, low quality teaching, segregation, and the poor environmental climate created by the bleak areas of the core city. While these problems mount, the middle class has continued its out-migration to the suburbs and has tended to forsake any responsibility for the core city school dilemmas.

Metropolitanism is, in part, the search for a new political structure. The structure sought is one that will meliorate the condition of the cities. For New York City, melioration may simply mean survival, if Lindsay's analysis is accurate; for other cities, melioration holds the promise of survival with grace and quality. The achievement of any degree of new metropolitan political structure means social change. One can expect that the familiar agonies which have attended other social change processes will be present at this one as well.

Metropolitanism is also a state of mind.[6] It is the state of mind of the citizen who perceives the larger community of which his local community is a part; the state of mind of the citizen who asks questions and seeks solutions in the larger field as well as in the local arena. In this sense, progress towards the metropolitan ideal--if progress, indeed, there is to be--may be roughly measured by the proportion and the kinds of people who come to take this broader view of community, and by the action that results from this shared concern.

---

[6] Havighurst, Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 6.

Two aspects of metropolitanism, those of inter-school district and inter-agency cooperation, serve as the focus of this monograph. Cooperation among school districts in metropolitan areas is highly varied and often unique to the particular SMSA. The range of cooperation runs from the informal and infrequent communication patterns by school heads to a formalized and funded structure through which the school districts receive common services. Inter-agency cooperation has a similar range of communication modes. Inter-agency cooperation can broadly be interpreted to include the interaction of those social agencies which influence the education of a child and the environment in which he functions, in attaining that education.

The investigation for the monograph is directed at synthesizing the relevant literature concerning the aspects of inter-school district and inter-agency cooperation. This synthesis, then, serves as a springboard for interviewing the core city superintendents of nine Ohio metropolitan areas and the following in-depth studies of some of the cooperative projects.

The basic intent of the monograph is to describe some of the cooperative efforts of schools in Ohio metropolitan areas, to relate these observed efforts to the "state of the art" as described in the literature, and to summarize these efforts and relationships. This study is not intended to be a total description of all the cooperative efforts by schools in Ohio, but rather one aimed at exploring and explicating some of the on-going projects of metropolitan cooperation.

CHAPTER II

METROPOLITAN AREA COOPERATIVE EFFORTS

Problems and Definitions

Metropolitan Problems

Civil disturbances have brought many of the problems of American society into sharp focus. A new chapter in the history of civil disturbances was begun in 1963 and 1964. Within twelve months there were serious civil difficulties in Birmingham, Savannah, Chicago, and Philadelphia. Racial trouble also developed in Jacksonville, St. Augustine, and Philadelphia, Mississippi. The New York City area was rocked by disorder, with very serious difficulties occurring in Harlem, the Bedford Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, Jersey City, Elizabeth and Paterson, New Jersey. The solidly Negro Watts section of Los Angeles was under a state of martial law for a week, during which time dozens of lives were lost and property damage exceeded many millions of dollars. In 1966 it was Chicago, Cleveland, and many others for a total of 43 riots or disorders for that one year alone. In 1967 violence came to Tampa, Cincinnati, Atlanta, Newark, Plainfield, New Brunswick, Detroit, and others.[7]

A growing,and increasingly younger population has also been a prime cause of national problems. The population is in a continuous state of flux, characterized by migration away from rural-agricultural areas and the southern, predominantly black areas of the nation to the commercial-industrial metropolitan areas. The relocation of people in the metropolitan areas has resulted in the creation of situations and problems incomprehensible a quarter of a century ago. The increasing demand for the technically trained workers needed to satisfy the requirements of the metropolitan labor market, and the fact that the educational and governmental systems are ill prepared and poorly equipped to meet the training and service demands placed upon them also must be added to the list of metropolitan problems.

---

[7] National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (New York: The New York Times Company, 1968), pp. 35-108.

As the population of the cities increased, an outward flow of people began. With this movement from the core of the city, new communities sprang up, each taking on certain characteristics peculiar unto itself. The persons settling in each new community were characteristically similar in ethnic origin, occupation, education, income, and values. Added to this imbroglio, residents at the extreme ends of the social and occupational scale tended to separate themselves by as much distance as was possible. Robert Wood noted another compounding factor in the social process of "like living with like" by pointing out that "the governments of the area served as catalysts to promote a sense of separate identity and community consciousness for their inhabitants by equipping the neighborhoods with legal boundaries and political processes all their own; and by maintaining separate governmental institutions, elections, and bureaucracies they added a further element of diversity."[8]

If one were to take a look at the metropolitan area and the problems encompassed therein, one would see something similar to the following:

1. The population is becoming increasingly more socioeconomically and racially segregated.

---

[8] Robert C. Wood, Metropolis Against Itself (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1959), p. 12.

2. Civic and social relations between the various socio-economic groups are weakening.

3. There is considerable poverty in the core areas, as well as general living problems, such as a lack of services, transportation, and recreational areas.

Stein, after reviewing a number of leading community studies of the 1930's, 40's, and 50's, suggests that American community development can be largely explained by the unfolding of three great social processes: urbanization, industrialization, and bureaucratization.[9] These processes, in combination with the demographic fact of increasing concentration of a growing population, have created the metropolis. This combination of factors can be conveniently subsumed under the phrase "increase in societal scale."[10]

The monopolistic political structure of the big cities has most often been contained in the political machines. Through this centralized power, often supported by graft and rejuvenated by patronage, it was possible not to merely maintain a governmental agency, but to actually run the massive and often cumbersome wheels of the city. Greer describes the usefulness of the machines in terms of their maintenance of control in relation to the vast problems of growth which faced emerging cities.[11] Recently, big cities have witnessed the disintegration of the political machine due primarily to the emergence of new leaders of ethnic and racial groups, the flight of the middle and upper classes to the suburbs, and the availability of channels of communication to everyone.

---

[9] Maurice R. Stein, The Eclipse of Community: An Interpretation of American Studies (New York: Harper & Row, 1960), p. 99.

[10] Scott Greer, The Emerging City: Myth and Reality (New York: The Free Press, 1962), pp. 33 ff.

[11] Scott Greer, Governing the Metropolis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962), p. 63.

At the present time, the sphere of influence of the business and financial groups and of the political machines appears to have weakened, due to metropolitan areas becoming increasingly larger and more complex, and other groups becoming conscious of their own power control over the metropolitan area. The resultant outcome has been a pluralistic fragmentation of power in many major urban complexes. This fragmentation of power, when carried to an extreme, can result in a disintegration of the services provided the electorate by the public agencies.[12]

Definitions

Though the term metropolitan area has been used previously, the concept of metropolitanism may need to be further defined, according to the way in which the term is being used. A metropolitan area can be defined for statistical purposes as a Standard Metropolitan Area or SMSA.[13] It may be thought of politically as consisting of numerous governments, both in the central city and the suburbs.[14, 15] Sociologists define a metropolitan area as a grouping of social systems, a social system being a set of roles and constellations of roles.[16] A metropolitan area can also be defined economically.[17]

---

[12] For a comprehensive description of the current metropolitan situation, including an investigation of its extremes and alternatives, see Roscoe Martin, Metropolis in Transition: Local Government Adaptation to Changing Urban Needs (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 134.

[13] Joseph Zimmerman (ed.), 1968 Metropolitan Area Annual (Albany, New York: Graduate School of Public Affairs, State University of New York at Albany, 1968), p.1.

[14] Wood, Metropolis Against Itself, p. 41.

[15] Roscoe C. Martin, Government and the Suburban School (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962), pp. 7, 18-19, 20, 59, 88.

[16] Levine and Havighurst, "Social Systems of a Metropolitan Area," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 37.

[17] David Minar, "Interactions of School and Local Non-School Governments in Metropolitan Areas," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 19?.

Metropolitanism as a concept is the result of the action or activity of a metropolitan area. It is the adaptation and integration of the activity in a metropolitan area.[18] Metropolitanism is also, in part, the search for a new political structure. The structure sought is one that will meliorate the condition of the cities.

Metropolitanism can also be a state of mind.[19] It is the state of mind of the citizen who asks questions about, and seeks solutions in, the entire metropolitan arena as well as in the local community.

A social system has already been defined as a set of roles and constellations of roles. Many authors have classified the important social systems in most metropolitan areas.[20, 21, 22, 23] Havighurst proposes eight "critical" social systems -- education, government, welfare, economic, culture, transportation, church, and civic organizations. These are classified as critical in that their functions are changing under the pressure of social change.[24]

These social systems become integrative and adaptive through the taxonomy suggested by Martin. He has ranked the categories in rough order from informal to formal, and from local to regional:

Procedural Adaptation

1. Informal cooperation
2. Service contract

---

[18] Irwin T. Sanders, The Community: An Introduction to a Social System (New York: The Ronald Press, 1966), pp. 476-478.

[19] Havighurst, "Introduction," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 6.

[20] Sanders, The Community, p. 31.

[21] Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Performance of Urban Functions: Local and Areawide (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1963), p. 8.

[22] W. W. Chase, "Problems in Planning Urban School Facilities," Association of School Business Officials Yearbook, L (1964), p. 237.

[23] Havighurst, Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 37.

[24] Ibid., 52-53.

3. Parallel action (joint decision, separate action)
4. Conference or council without sanctions
5. Compact (binds parties to reciprocal action)
6. Transfer of functions to higher authority
7. Extra-territorial jurisdiction
8. Incorporation

Structural Adaptation

9. Annexation
10. City-county separation
11. Geographical consolidation
12. Functional consolidation
13. Creation of special districts
14. Creation of an authority
15. Creation of a metropolitan government
16. Creation of a regional agency.[25]

What is the place of the school in society? Historically, schools have stood apart from the political machines and the political wars of the big cities. This position has been reinforced by the legislation of the rural dominated state governing bodies, for education has been considered as a function of the state. In essence, the school district has become a special district with its own built-in governing, financing, and planning organizations.[26, 27, 28, 29]

The school leaders themselves have helped perpetuate this situation:

> It has long been a basic principle among school administrators that the school system should be protected from invasion by other social systems. Professor Strayer of Columbia University, the most influential leader among school administrators during the period from 1920 to about 1945 said frequently what he wrote in his report on the Chicago school survey in 1932, 'It is always a mistake for the schools

---

[25] Martin, Metropolis in Transition, pp. 3-12.

[26] John C. Bollens, Special District Governments in the U.S. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), p. 191.

[27] Martin, Government and the Suburban School, p. 77.

[28] William Firman, "Fiscal Independence of School Systems," Trends in Financing Public Education (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1965), p. 117.

[29] David Minar, "The Politics of Education in Large Cities," Educating an Urban Population, Marilyn Gittell, (ed.) (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1967), p. 315.

> to be organized so that agencies other than a board of education are responsible for the administration of vital and indispensible services in the schools.'[30]

Today, many educators see the role of the school as becoming more involved with other social systems.[31] Education is often seen by civic leaders as serving to improve the city, not only through its effects on the minds and characters of students, but also through its effects on the economic system and the social structure of the city.

The school system is seen as an instrument for attracting and holding desirable population elements in the central cities, for stabilizing racially integrated neighborhoods, and for solving or holding in check the problems of an alienated and economically marginal minority of slum dwellers. The new role of the schools has been summarized by Dr. Vincent Conroy of Harvard University:

> The inability of other public and private agencies to solve social problems in communities has often resulted in the thrusting of new roles upon the schools, which seem to have become the dumping grounds for social dilemmas. Although education should indeed have some separateness, some life of its own, education must, in the absence of alternatives assume a reforming function in society.[32]

This does not mean, however, that educators are the "saviors" of their communities, for:

> As one attempts to predict the new role for city schools in the years ahead, he finds their futures inextricably bound with conditions in housing and employment, transportation, technology, urban renewal, and welfare. Without the coordination of all these functions, attempts to improve schooling will be severely limited. To act as a catalytic agent, to demand cooperation in this process, becomes a priority of educational leadership.[33]

---

[30] Robert J. Havighurst, Education in Metropolitan Areas (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966), p. 227.

[31] Firman, "Fiscal Independence of School Systems," p. 124.

[32] Vincent F. Conroy, "Hartford: A Case Study of Metropolitan Planning in Education," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 324.

[33] Ibid.

Lastly, the over-used, but under-defined term, cooperation, refers here to the working together of two or more people or agencies in the processes of planning and implementation for the purpose of achieving mutually beneficial outcomes or results.

Inter-Agency Cooperation

Introduction

This section will examine the relationships which do exist, or should exist, between school systems and other governmental agencies. The subject of inter-agency cooperation will be developed in an attempt to view (1) why cooperation should be pursued, (2) resistance factors which hinder cooperation, (3) examples of cooperation, and (4) the future prospects for cooperation. Before looking at inter-agency cooperation, which is basically an effect, it may be useful to explore some of its immediate causes.

Rationale for Cooperation

Most writers agree that to solve many of our urban problems, there must be greater cooperation between the schools and other governmental agencies.[34, 35, 36] Havighurst, writing in Phi Delta Kappan, says:

> In a society undergoing rapid change toward increased interdependence, however, it is more difficult for a social system to achieve its goals if it attempts to maintain traditional roles and functions in continuing isolation from other social systems. Our own society has evolved so rapidly toward increased interdependence that it is no longer possible to conceive solutions for the problems faced by a major social system without reference to the functioning of other systems.[37]

No agency within the metropolitan complex is able to function in isolation today. Whatever an agency does, consequences result which affect the activity of other agencies.

---

[34] Donald Leu and Carl Candoli, A Feasibility Study of the Cultural-Educational Park for Chicago (East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1968).

[35] Chase, "Problems in Planning Urban School Facilities," p. 237.

[36] John Bollens and Henry Schmandt, The Metropolis, Its People, Politics, and Economic Life (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 45-46.

[37] Robert Havighurst, "Big City Education: A Cooperative Endeavor," Phi Delta Kappan, 48 (March, 1967), p. 320.

One reason for cooperation, then, is because the functions of agencies overlap.

There are a great many arguments for inter-agency cooperation found under the rubric of "equality of educational opportunity." Cunningham defines the existence of such equality as occurring "when each child of school age residing within a school district has equal access to the educative resources of the district essential to his needs."[38] Most metropolitan schools differ as to their ability to provide educative resources, hence other social systems should be utilized when they are available.[39, 40] Resources include values brought to the school, and may also be supplemented by social systems outside of the home.

Coleman says, concerning equal opportunity:

> Two points, then, are clear: (1) these minority children have a serious educational deficiency at the start of school, which is obviously not a result of school; and (2) they have an even more serious deficiency at the end of school, which is obviously in part a result of school....
>
> Per pupil expenditure, books in the library, and a host of other facilities in curricular measures show virtually no relation to achievement if the "social" environment of the school--the educational backgrounds of other students and teachers--is held constant....
>
> Altogether, the sources of inequality of educational opportunity appear to lie first in the home itself in the cultural influences immediately surrounding the home; then they lie in the schools' ineffectiveness to free achievement from the impact of the home, and in the schools' cultural homogeneity which perpetuates the social influences of the home and its environs.[41]

There is considerable controversy as to whether "cultural enrichment" is the answer to equalizing equality of educational opportunity, especially in ghetto schools. Although Kenneth Clark blasts cultural deprivation theories as themselves having a great deal to do with the poor quality of education in Black inner city areas,[42] it is difficult to deny the advantages of making cultural facilities available to school children. One of the major recommendations made to the Chicago schools by a private educational planning organization was to "make greater use of Chicago's vast cultural facilities to add enrichment to the lives of the children."[43]

---

[38] Luvern Cunningham, "Equality of Opportunity: Is it Possible in Education?" Administrators Notebook, XVI (November, 1967), p. 1.

[39] Havighurst, Education in Metropolitan Areas, pp. 166, 189.

[40] Firman, "Fiscal Independence of School Systems," p. 124.

[41] James S. Coleman, "Equal Schools for Equal Students?" The Metropolis in Crisis, edited by Hadden, Masotti, and Larson (Itaska, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1967), pp. 294-395.

Many others have been echoing the theme of equal opportunity. Their statements have implications for improved educational services through the medium of community agency mobilization.[44, 45, 46, 47] Nystrand and Kean have also dealt with issues related to "cultural enrichment."[48, 49]

As has been previously stated, education has historically been a separatist among the other social systems. Minar has attacked the weaknesses of this position by noting (1) the government has enlarged its scope by defining education in a broader context and (2) the actual functions of the school system are tightly inter-twined with those of the municipality and of the other local jurisdictions.[50] Havighurst reinforces this position, yet allays the fears of those who oppose mixing education with politics, by asserting that "...as city government has become increasingly responsible for welfare in the broad sense, its possibilities for operating in its own narrow interest have decreased. It seems to be as safe as anything is in modern urban life for the city school system to cooperate with other systems concerned with the welfare and general education of young people."[51]

---

[42] Kenneth Clark, Dark Ghetto (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 131.

[43] "Big City Survival Plan," The American School Board Journal, XV (September, 1968), p. 15.

[44] Richard L. Derr, "Planning Education Today for Tomorrow," Educating an Urban Population, edited by Marilyn Gittell, (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1967), p. 275.

[45] Havighurst, Education in Metropolitan Areas, p. 164.

[46] Havighurst, "Big City Education: A Cooperative Endeavor," p. 320.

[47] Charles S. Benson, "The Economics of Education in Urban Society," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII (March, 1967), p. 316.

[48] Raphael Nystrand, et al., School Community Relations in Four Cincinnati Neighborhoods: A Report to the Cincinnati School Survey, mimeographed (1968), p. 2.

[49] Michael H. Kean, "Achieving Racial Integration in Urban Schools," mimeographed (1968), p. 2.

[50] Martin, Metropolis in Transition.

Proponents of greater cooperation and of higher structural adaptation between governmental agencies argue that a single, comprehensive governmental agency should assess the merits of the financial needs of all public agencies. Schools have a similar legislative relationship with the state as those other agencies which are presently considered under the domain of the municipal government, e.g., health, law enforcement, and public welfare. In the centralization of agencies, a greater integration of services could be accomplished, as well as a simplification of the election process of public officials. It is asserted that, corresponding to this simplification, an increased accountability of those officials elected by the citizenry will develop.[52]

The major findings of a classic study conducted jointly by a professor of political science and a professor of education at the University of Chicago in 1938, indicated that schools were not subject to increased political pressure when they were dependent upon a municipal form of government, and that the services provided to both the municipal and the school agencies, when centralized, would be improved more often than they would be impaired.[53]

---

[51] Robert J. Havighurst, "Planning Concepts and New Directions - Education," The People Versus the System, Sol Tax, ed. (Chicago: Acme Press, 1968), p. 203.

[52] Bollens, Special District Governments in the U.S., p. 192.

Both logic and research findings indicate that a more centralized form of governing public agencies gives each of the agencies better services, better planning mechanisms, and a better financial base from a more diverse tax structure. Such a governmental form would simplify the elective process and inject a greater accountability factor for those who are elected to the central governmental positions.

The motivating psychological factors in any decision to expand relations with the larger society always include, at least, fear, self-interest, and pride. To be successful at the local level, the appeal for greater cooperation should be related to one or more of these factors.

Inter-agency cooperation will have to do something for the local school district that the district perceives as necessary and useful. Ultimately, this means that the electorate will have to perceive the need. Martin lists some hypotheses concerning the nature of local government adaptation to metropolitan needs. These include:

1. Metropolitan action normally results from a particular problem.

2. Adaptive action will be taken only after an extended period of incubation.

3. Without skilled and experienced political leadership, a proposal for metropolitan action is not likely to be successful.

4. A campaign of civic education is necessary for success.

5. Citizens generally fail to respond to reorganization campaigns with any marked show of interest.

6. Almost every local adaptation to changing needs results from compromises.

---

[53] Henry Nelson and Jerome Derwin, Schools and City Government: A Study of Municipal Relationships in Cities of 50,000 or More Population (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), Chapter 8.

7. Fortuitous developments constitute an unforeseeable, but inescapable component in the metropolitan decision making process.

8. In any appraisal of metropolitan decision making, the role of the State must be judged to be of fundamental importance.

9. The Federal Government has come to play an important role in the metropolitan decision making process.[54]

Finally, cooperation is often instigated by a powerful person, or a small group of influential people. The community school concept in Flint, Michigan was begun by the philanthropist Charles Mott, and in Huntsville, Alabama, cooperation was motivated by the Association of Huntsville Area Companies.

Examples of Inter-Agency Cooperation

The largest percentage of inter-agency cooperation taking place today is on the local level. However, this cooperation usually does not take place throughout the entire metropolitan area; it is predominantly between the central city and its agencies, or between a suburb and its agencies. Some area-wide cooperation, however, has resulted from specific State or Federal legislation.

Except for special acts, the State governments have not been deeply involved in inter-agency cooperation. It also seems apparent that State government has a good deal of catching up to do.[55] However, there is evidence of increasing recognition of the crucial role to be performed.

Much of the cooperation which is taking place today is not regularly found in educational or governmental literature, yet is very important in the day-to-day operations of a school system. This cooperation is of an informal nature, and often has no formal structure. For example, in solving specific problems, a superintendent might work with the welfare office, the courts, or the recreation department by merely using the telephone.

---

[54] Martin, Metropolis in Transition, pp. 130-133.

[55] Roald F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1965), p. 75.

There are many different models of cooperation, both in theory and in practice. In some models the mayor acts as the integrating force through his power to appoint people to various boards.[56, 57] In other models the school system works separately with many of the other social systems, and there is no overall integration of agencies.[58] Derr has set forth two theoretical models which relate to a strategy for the integration of agencies, and a strategy of functional autonomy.[59]

The following sections will examine specific examples of inter-agency cooperation in metropolitan areas, both on the local level, and through programs sponsored by the Federal government.

The two most significant attempts at metropolitan area-wide cooperation are found in Dade County, Florida, and Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee. In both cases a metropolitan area government has been created.

The attempt to evoke a metropolitan governmental form in Nashville-Davidson County involved a structural reorganization at the functional consolidation or the special district level. Each of the agencies have maintained their integrity, with the reorganization taking place between the city and the county agencies. As this form

---

[56] Robert A. Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), p. 150.

[57] John Harris, Robert Hemberger, and Frederick Goodnight, "School Reorganization in a Metropolitan Area: The Nashville Experience," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 30.

[58] Ibid., pp. 381-383.

[59] Derr, "Planning Education Today for Tomorrow," pp. 273-274, 278-283.

of metropolitan reorganization moves forward in the Nashville area, inter-agency cooperation is at a relatively rudimentary level.[60]

Dade County (which includes Miami), appears to have a model of structural adaptation similar to that of Nashville. In the attempts to secure passage of the metropolitan form of government, concessions had to be granted to various factions in the county. A new governmental form, made possible through a revised county charter, has been responsible for assigning important regional functions to the county, although cities perform most of the customary activities. Because of compromises resulting from the many assaults on the charter and the council-manager plan of government, the area has existed in a politically unsettled environment.[61]

Local examples of inter-agency cooperation may be found in a variety of forms, from cooperation with one or two agencies to special projects which draw upon the resources of many agencies.

Probably the largest number of formal agreements between school systems and one or two local agencies are never reported. For example, many school systems have arrangements with the local library and recreational districts. These agreements usually include formal policy making boards or councils.[62, 63]

Formal structures involving the schools and health, welfare, and justice agencies are beginning to appear more frequently in the literature. A school-hospital combination is functioning in Kansas City, Missouri to care for handicapped children.[64] Kansas City also provides three homes for neglected and delinquent youths in which the school system is heavily involved.[65] In 1967 the Oakland, California schools joined with that city's health and welfare agencies to establish a special school for girls who drop out of school because of pregnancy.[66]

---

[60] Harris, et. al., Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, pp. 352-383.

[61] Winston W. Crouch, "Conflict and Co-operation Among Local Governments in the Metropolis," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Harry W. Reynolds, Jr., ed., CCCLIX (May, 1965), p. 68.

[62] Havighurst, Education in Metropolitan Areas, p. 226.

[63] Levine and Havighurst, "Social Systems of a Metropolitan Area," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, pp. 54-57.

Many examples of cooperation between the schools and the economic sector of the community can be found in the literature. Dayton's Patterson High School operates completely on a cooperative basis with business and industry. A training program for ghetto dwellers in Boston is operating through school and industry cooperation. Other examples can be found in Texas City, Texas, and San Diego, California. Companies with specific programs include the Michigan Bell Telephone Company, the Ford Motor Company, and the Mead Paper Company.[67]

One excellent example of school-industry cooperation can be found in Indianapolis at the Wood High School. This is an old high school in one of the oldest areas of the inner-city. It boasts such facilities as a complete bakery and dry cleaning plant in addition to the more common auto shops. The unusual thing about Wood is that it goes to the commercial and industrial community, determines what they need in the way of trained manpower, and then develops a course of study in that particular vocational area with the understanding that the trade or industry will supply them with the latest equipment and instructors to work in the schools.

Specific projects can be found which attempt to use local resources to solve particular problems. In 1967 the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction published a document entitled PURE--Project to Utilize Resources in Education. This volume lists hundreds of descriptions of outstanding programs utilizing a wide variety of resources.

---

[64] Harold Punke, Community Use of Public School Facilities (New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1951), p. 211.

[65] Havighurst, Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 63.

[66] Havighurst, "Big City Education: A Cooperative Approach," p. 320.

[67] J. G. Sullivan, "Cooperation: With Vigor," New York State Education, LV (February, 1968), p. 12.

An outstanding example of a project-type of cooperation is found in Project BRITE of the Saginaw, Michigan schools. Project BRITE (Bridging Resources to Improve Teaching for Everyone) is a program designed to incorporate the services and resources of various community agencies in an effort to improve education for all age groups. The term resource is defined to include special school services, community agencies, churches, recreational facilities, and service clubs. The project is designed to function on two levels--that of a General Needs Service Center and Neighborhood School Centers. The General Needs Service Center includes medical and dental facilities and services, legal aid, a planned parenthood clinic, neighbor youth corps for school drop-outs, and education, vocational, and employment counseling. Among the services provided by the Neighborhood School Centers are adult education, agency-sponsored activities such as Scouting and Big Brothers, recreation, and counseling and referral services including social, health, educational, and vocational.[68]

The community school concept is a more general attempt to utilize community resources. Those community schools mentioned most often in the literature are found in Flint, Michigan, New Haven, Connecticut, and Wilmington, Delaware.[69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74] Varying degrees of cooperation can be found in each of these.

---

[68] School District of the City of Saginaw, Michigan, Project BRITE: Bridging Resources to Improve Teaching for Everyone (Saginaw, Michigan: School District of Saginaw, Michigan, 1968), p. 1-130.

Federally-Sponsored Cooperative Efforts

If the stimulus for inter-agency cooperation is to come from above the local level, it must issue from the State and Federal governments. To date, the Federal government has assumed the more active role. A number of Federal programs have required inter-agency or regional planning as a condition for the granting of funds. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 emphasized inter-agency cooperation in three of its five titles. Title I provides for aid to disadvantaged youth through half-a-dozen non-school social systems. Title II emphasizes supplies, equipment, and particularly books, and in doing so, provides a ready financial means for non-school administered library systems to work with educational systems. Title III involves supplementary educational centers and created the PACE concept (Programs to Advance Creativity in Education). Among the hundreds of PACE Projects funded each year, a substantial number of them involve a high degree of inter-agency cooperation.[75, 76] The Federal government also encourages cooperation through the Model

---

[69] R. M. Goglia, "New Haven Turns to Year-round Community Schools," Nation's Schools, LXXX (September, 1967), pp. 62-63.

[70] G. A. Budig, "Governmental Affairs Person in the Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, IL (February, 1968), p. 22.

[71] Seymour Rosenthal and George Arnstein, "Where Schools Fit the Model Cities Program," Nation's Schools, LXXX (September, 1967), pp. 59-65.

[72] Muriel Crosby, "Everybody Gets Into the Act," National Education Association Journal, LIV (November, 1965), p. 23.

[73] "Urban Education: The Big Push is On," Nation's Schools, LXXX (September, 1967), p. 63.

[74] Barry Herman, "Winchester Community School," Educational Leadership, XXV (January, 1968), p. 342.

[75] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Pacesetters in Innovation: Fiscal Year 1967, II (Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1968), pp. 1-125.

[76] Sidney Tiedt, The Role of the Federal Government in Education (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 144-166.

Cities and Urban Renewal programs.[77,78]

Resistance to Cooperation

There are two basic kinds of resistance to inter-agency cooperation: external and internal. External resistance comes from people and groups outside of specific social agencies desiring to cooperate. These may include citizens, other levels of government, and businessmen. Often these groups will not hinder cooperation actively, but will not work to further cooperation either. For example, State legislatures might hinder cooperation by ignoring legislation which would permit cooperation.

Internal resistance is generated by relations within any particular agency (schools, welfare groups, etc.), or resistance between agencies.

External Resistance

Citizens often stand in the way of social system cooperation either actively or as the result of apathy.[79] The average metropolitan citizen may be so occupied with his own interests and neighborhood that he finds it difficult to identify with people in other areas. The suburbanite, who has escaped the problems of the central city, may experience the freedom of relief, and soon forgets about the central city. He may have some vague idea of the interdependence between the central city and the suburbs when it comes to occupation, food, clothing, and recreation; but he rarely relates this to the need for coordinating the agencies within the metropolitan area to bring about a better life for everyone. This lack of awareness of metropolitan inter-

---

[77] Rosenthal and Arnstein, "Where Schools Fit the Model Cities Program," Nation's Schools, p. 60.

[78] Donald Bourgeois, "Case Presentation: St. Louis," The People Vs. the System, pp. 416-420.

[79] Levine and Havighurst, "Social Systems of a Metropolitan Area," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 45.

dependence was demonstrated in 1965 through an attitude survey conducted in the St. Louis City-County area.[80]

Other levels of government often hinder cooperation. For example, State legislatures often reflect the basic political conservatism of the people, and are slow to adopt needed legislation for social change. Politicians often are unwilling to get too far ahead of the voters in areas of social change.

The diversity of jurisdiction of social systems is an area which must be considered before a program of inter-agency cooperation can be made to work. It is one thing to organize agencies of like jurisdiction (e.g., city, county, state, federal), and quite another when the agencies derive their power and financial support from different governmental units. For instance, a city school system may wish to work with the welfare agency which may be state-run or the library system which may be county-run.

The Federal government often hinders cooperation. It may provide roadblocks by forcing cities into unusual relationships in order to obtain Federal monies. School personnel often refuse to become involved in sensitive social issues because of their fear of Federal control. On the other hand, the Federal government often pushes for these programs. As Lewis McGuinness has pointed out:

> By their very nature, community action programs, if they are to succeed, are designed to push hard and fast for many diverse social changes. In may ways schools tend to look at them like old fashioned, stand-pattish organizations that are to be assaulted in the name of social reform.[81]

---

[80] Bollens and Schmandt, The Metropolis: Its People, Politics, and Economic Life, p. 46.

[81] Levine and Havighurst, Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 67.

Hunter and Mason have discussed the power structure of the community as it is controlled by economic interests, and note that cooperation can be hindered by the power of the business community.[82, 83]

Internal Resistance

Resistance to cooperation often comes from both other social agencies and the schools. Because most social systems are institutionalized bureaucracies with distinctive vested interests and professional norms, conflicts and problems are created which are not easily or quickly resolved.[84]

All systems fear the competition of other agencies, and the loss of power, prestige, or identify.[85, 86, 87] The question of who will run the program looms as a major roadblock to cooperation.

Since the schools have always been autonomous, they have often refused to get involved in politics.[88, 89, 90] In fact, school personnel have often held other social agencies responsible for school problems.[91]

---

[82] Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1953), p. 81.

[83] Robert Mason, "Decline and Crisis in Big City Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII (March, 1967), p. 309.

[84] Levine and Havighurst, Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 66.

[85] David Minar, "Interactions of Schools and Local Non-School Governments in Metropolitan Areas," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 218.

[86] David Minar, "The Politics of Education in Large Cities," Educating An Urban Population, p. 313.

[87] Levine and Havighurst, Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 46.

[88] C. V. Willie, "New Perspectives in School-Community Relations," Journal of Negro Education, XXXVII (Summer, 1968), p. 220.

[89] Havighurst, "Big City Education: A Cooperative Approach, Phi Delta Kappan, p. 320.

[90] Minar, Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 222.

[91] Havighurst, Education in Metropolitan Areas, p. 228.

There is usually heavy internal resistance to cooperation until the question of who will pay for the programs is settled. Because of the fragmentation of government responsibilities, agencies are often in competition for financial support.[92] As long as agencies operate as fiscally independent, autonomous units, it can be expected that metropolitan fiscal planning and policy making will be fragmented and unable to deal effectively with metropolitan problems.

Conclusions

Former President Johnson painted a truly optimistic picture of future cooperation when he said that "Tomorrow's school will be a school without walls--a school built of doors which open to the entire community."[93] Other people are also optimistic about the future, but cite social problems as the catalyst for cooperation.

A number of writers tell us that social problems and the resulting urban crises will force closer cooperation between the schools and other social systems.[94] McGuinness suggests that certain social changes are pre-ordaining the direction that the schools will be required to take:

> ... the growing magnitude of social problems and the problems of the schools in dealing with the lower-class children are, I believe, rapidly forcing the large school systems into taking a wide public viewpoint of their social obligations to the child as a whole. This includes the child's parents and other siblings and even the child's neighborhood.[95]

---

[92] The Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, October 20, 1968.

[93] Lyndon B. Johnson, Address to the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 16, 1966.

[94] Norman Beckman, "The Outlook for Cooperation in Metropolitan Areas," Trends in Financing Public Education (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965), p. 202.

[95] Lewis J. McGuinness, "The Role of the Public School in Organizing, Coordinating, and Financing Community Action Programs," Partnership in School Finance (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966), p. 139.

Coleman also suggests a similar direction.[96]

Among the most promising factors for future cooperation between the educational system and other social systems are the model city programs, urban coalitions, and metropolitan federations. Model city programs are often erroneously thought to be nothing more than glorified urban renewal projects, when in actuality they focus upon a total approach to urban problems. Such programs recognize that "no one problem can be solved by itself--a housing program, for example, can fail if nothing is done about family income. Family income in turn, is affected by education, health services, discrimination in jobs, and many other things."[97] Thus, model city programs attempt to discover all of the problems which plague an area, and how each affects the other as well as the general well-being of the area.

Benson sees Federal participation as a motivating force for future cooperation. He notes that

> ...the barriers are being broken down, and part of the credit must go to the federal government. There is such a degree of overlap between the Economic Opportunity Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 that school authorities have the strongest inducement to cooperate with those local officials who have responsibilities in housing, welfare, health, recreation, and urban planning generally.[98]

Perhaps the most promising indication of future inter-agency cooperation is the fact that a great many independent analyses of urban problems have recently been completed, or are presently under way. Detroit (by the Free Press), Oakland and Columbus (by the Urban League), and New York (by the Rand Corporation at the request of Mayor Lindsay) are four cities in which such independent analyses have already pointed up or will soon point up the need for inter-agency cooperation. These and other cities have begun to realize that their present programs are inadequate, and that they must seek a more successful solution. Inter-agency cooperation may be just that solution.

---

[96] James S. Coleman, "Equal Schools or Equal Students?" The Metropolis in Crisis, p. 294.

[97] The St. Louis Model City Voice, I (March, 1968), p. 5.

[98] Charles S. Benson, Education is Good Business (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1966), p. 41.

What forms will future cooperation take? Opinions differ from those who see large metropolitan governments being created which control most of the public services to those who see loose federations of cooperating agencies.

With the interdependence of the central city and its surrounding suburban areas rapidly becoming an accepted reality, the idea of a metropolitan federation to aid in cooperative interaction is developing. Paralleling this inter-corporation (or intra-metropolitan area) cooperative movement is the recognition of a need for a metropolitan school authority relying heavily on inter-agency cooperation. Although the primary function of such an authority would be to coordinate educational finance, the inclusion of an inter-agency cooperation component would be quite easy to implement around the existing organizational structure.

Minar suggests that the goals of integrated units should be program coordination, sharing of information, and joint use of resources.[99] These goals would determine the form of the alliance.

Benson proposed a detailed administrative and financial framework which would permit movement toward a solution of the problems now existing in the field of education. The two major reforms he suggests are the establishment of the minimum size for a school district of 250,000 population (except in areas of extremely scattered population), and integration of the school and general municipal governments into one body of local government.[100]

---

[99] Minar, "Interactions of School and Local Non-School Governments in Metropolitan Areas," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 218.

Finally, Martin feels that the following prospective developments in relations between the public schools and general governments can be identified with some assurance:

1. Centralization will continue to take place, and the local districts will suffer a further decline in autonomy in the face of the state's increasing interest and activity in the field of public education.

2. The trend in school district reorganization will continue; as the numbers of districts become smaller the districts themselves will become larger in size.

3. A closer integration of the school districts with the units of general local government, or at least of the public schools with other local government activities, will take place.[101]

---

[100] Benson, Education is Good Business, Chapter IV.

[101] Martin, Government and the Suburban School, pp. 101-102.

Inter-School Cooperation

Introduction

The phenomenon of metropolitanism, as we witness it today in the large urban centers of our country, contains within its sphere of influence the concept of cooperation. The latter has been defined as "action on the part of individuals or groups integrated toward a single effect or toward the achievement of a common purpose."[102] In an educational frame of reference cooperation is somewhat a cloudy term. Perhaps it can best be understood through conceptualizing a continuum. At one terminal of the continuum, cooperation can be conceived as a simple relationship between two or more school districts engaged in a laissez-faire fashion to share services. Herein the autonomy of the districts is not surrendered. At the other terminal, cooperation appears to be a device enabling fragmented districts of a metropolitan area to unite their efforts to reorganize their school districts. Herein local autonomy would be sacrificed to secure metropolitan educational government which for some functions would be centralized and others decentralized.

Cooperation does not come from the district voters, citizens, or parents. In the Brechler study, superintendents overwhelmingly supported the above statement.[103] Cooperation is characterized by informality, a minimization of conflict, and frequent contact between superintendents of the school districts instead of citizens strongly advocating inter-district cooperation. The superintendent seems to be the key to inter-district cooperation, and cooperation is the key variable in inter-district relationships. Cooperation, then, should be one of the key factors in inter-school district relations, if it is defined as the joint pursuit of common ends between districts.

---

[102] Carter V. Good (ed.), Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959), p. 131.

[103] Fredrick C. Brechler, "Patterns of School District Interrelationships: A Study of the Kansas City Metropolitan Area," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1966, p. 99.

A metropolitan form of school government must have two distinct characteristics. First, the total educational process of the area must be under one type of organization for certain functions. These will vary from one SMSA to another, but would probably include such things as research planning, school building programs, special education programs, programs for handicapped children, and at least part of the tax base.

The second characteristic is a decentralization of many facets of the educational program such as curriculum, school organization, teacher selection, and opportunity to develop a program above that of the total organization.

Rationale for Cooperation

The rationale for developing inter-school system cooperation in metropolitan areas is varied and manifold. One rationale for having a metropolitan school government is to provide for the distribution of financial resources in such a way that the educational program throughout the metropolitan area will be at least adequate. The financial aspect would be by far the most powerful aspect of a metropolitan system to provide quality education to every student. This type of organization is not only beneficial to city school systems which have limited resources for education because of the "poverty-linked" services and "non-aided"[104] common services demanded by the city's poor and suburban population, but also to many suburban areas which, because of growth and lack of industry, also have limited resources available.

---

[104] Otto Eckstein, Public Finance (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.), p. 40.

A second rationale for metropolitan school government, or at least cooperation between existing school systems, is to provide equality of services. More adequate programs in vocational and special education could be provided if the school systems within the metropolis would cooperate and share the expense of operating such programs.

A third rationale is that the cooperative efforts of a metropolitan school government toward complete integration of the schools would be a major step toward the integration of social systems. The integration of the social systems would help to eliminate the racial barriers that still exist in the large city schools. A good example of such a cooperative effort took place in Berkeley, California, where total desegregation was accomplished in September, 1968, when white elementary pupils were bussed into Negro slum schools and Negro students were bussed into what had been predominantly white schools. The resulting classrooms reflect the Berkeley school population proportions: 50 per cent white, 41 per cent Negro, and 9 per cent Oriental and others. This achievement which involved a city of more than 100,000 population was accomplished through a vast program of preparation and involvement of teachers, students, and citizens.[105]

Rochester, New York recently developed a cooperative program in which 500 Negro children from the inner city schools are bussed to the surrounding suburban schools. At the same time a new "super-school" in the inner city will have a predominantly white enrollment drawn from the areas outside the ghetto, including the suburban areas. This school will be predominantly white (70 per cent), with one teacher per every ten students, and will emphasize independent study. It is known as the "World of Inquiry School"[106] and was scheduled to begin in 1968 with an enrollment of 130, eventually reaching 800 students.

---

[105] Phi Delta Kappan, (November, 1968), p. 151.

Cooperation among school systems within metropolitan areas may result in the provision of certain selected services in such a way that quality, economy, and efficiency are guaranteed. In some instances school systems would probably not be able to offer certain services unless some cooperative arrangements could be made. Cooperation may be regarded as a basis for further collaboration and for the eventual consolidation of school systems within metropolitan areas.

Districts seeking to maintain their autonomy utilize inter-district relationships to keep from having their problems solved at another level. In the Brechler study most districts indicated that they would cooperate with other districts as long as there was no threat of losing autonomy. Inter-district cooperation, therefore, is undertaken with mutual gain in mind.

Another finding of the Brechler study was the strong desire on the part of central city districts to get other districts to break down isolationist tendencies and cooperate in solving problems of concern to education. These superintendents involved in the study did not value being thought of as isolated by other school districts, and sought contact with other superintendents and districts.[107] In summary, maintaining autonomy and preventing isolation seem to be two chief reasons why school districts cooperate with each other.

---

[106] Robert E. Mason, "Decline and Crisis in Big City Education," Phi Delta Kappan, (March, 1967), p. 327.

[107] Brechler, "Patterns of School District Interrelationships," p. 149.

According to Bollens and Schmandt, there are other important reasons why governmental units including the schools cooperate with each other.[108] They noted that (1) cooperative devices provide a process for dealing with needs and problems on a voluntary basis and a means of retaining local determination and control; (2) cooperative devices serve as a countermove to demands for the creation of powerful metropolitan governments that would substantially reduce the authority of existing local units and possibly eliminate many of them; and (3) supporters look upon cooperation as contributing to increased efficiency and lower cost since this process makes it unnecessary for each local district to hire its own personnel and construct its own facilities for each service.

Brechler suggested that inter-district relationships on a low level of behavior serve as a sounding board for the school administrator to gauge his performance in comparison with other administrators.[109] Another pervasive reason why school districts cooperate is Federal legislation which is deliberately designed in some instances to encourage inter-governmental negotiations.[110] Evaluation and legislation evidently play important roles in school district cooperation.

Sebastian suggested that force from students is certainly one of the primary reasons why school districts cooperate. He noted that:

---

[108] Bollens and Schmandt, The Metropolis: Its People, Politics and Economic Life, 1965.

[109] Brechler, "Patterns of School District Interrelationships," p. 119.

[110] Winston W. Crouch, "Conflict and Cooperation Among Local Governments in a Metropolis," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 359 (May, 1965), p. 58.

> Large city educational systems have a new kind of pupil who is forcing them to seek new methods of teaching, new forms of vocational education and guidance, new kinds of teachers and new sources of revenue. Cooperative efforts thus far have shown that some of these problems can be attacked with a measure of success.[111]

Havighurst feels that while each person in the area is dependent upon all the others living and working amicably together, most persons find it difficult to conceive of the entire metropolitan area as their community. Ultimate survival dictates that persons living in a metropolitan area recognize that problems of the metropolitan area as a whole become neighborhood problems eventually.[112] Havighurst also makes note of the fact that "Educational inequities within a metropolitan area are visible on all sides--not only is there inequity in educational services between schools of the lower economic segments of the central city and suburban schools, there is inequality between contiguous school districts of neighboring suburbs."[113] Such inequities have created an explosive situation in the metropolitan areas of the country. The lack of cooperation between municipal and suburban school districts is responsible for many of the inequities, among which, the following four seem to be the most critical:

1. An imbalance between the poor Black and poor white child and their more affluent counterparts living in most suburban communities.
2. Economic inequities between those school districts having a firm industrial base for taxes and those without.
3. A severe shortage of sensitive, dedicated and highly qualified teachers to work in the central city school districts and poor suburban districts.
4. Inefficiency of operation in providing certain services to all students.

---

[111] C. P. Sebastian, "Cooperative Projects Affecting Public Education in Great Cities," Dissertation Abstracts, XXV, 6321.

[112] Robert Havighurst, "How Big City and Suburban Schools Can Get Together", Nation's Schools, LXXIV, (September, 1964), p. 60.

[113] Ibid.

There are about six thousand school districts in our metropolitan areas serving an estimated two-thirds of the school children in the United States. With this multiplicity of school districts--each with its own board, its own corps of teachers, its own academic standards, its own labor relations difficulties, and its own revenue and space problems--there has developed an educational fragmentation characterized not only by inefficiency and ineffectiveness, but also by inequality. As Havighurst has suggested, both suburban and core city schools exhibit several varieties of educational inequality.[114]

Large scale metropolitan cooperation has been rather difficult to establish. On three different occasions, proposals permitting metropolitan cooperation were defeated at the polls in St. Louis and Cleveland. One may, therefore, conclude that because proposals are made they will not always be willingly embraced by the people. That is a privilege people enjoy in a democracy. However, the reasons why people display their approval and disapproval are important. According to Cunningham, proponents of a metropolitan educational structure argue that it is efficient, that it places all of the financial resources of an SMSA behind the education of every child, that it possesses a built-in capacity to accommodate metropolitan growth and change; whereas, opponents argue that such a system is too large, that it covers too much territory, that it reduces the access of citizens to the points of educational decision-making, and that it exhibits all of the dysfunctional qualities of other large bureaucracies.[115]

---

[114] Ibid.

[115] Luvern L. Cunningham, "Organization of Education in Metropolitan Areas," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, p. 102.

A study of the recommendations of the Columbus, Ohio Report,[116] the Louisville-Jefferson County, Kentucky Report,[117] and the Purdy Report[118] to the Ohio Assembly revealed that the feasibility of a metropolitan-wide educational government is based upon at least five important propositions. Such an arrangement is feasible:

(1) When coordination of a function over the area is essential to effective service or control in any part of the area;

(2) When it is desirable to apply the ability-to-pay theory of taxation to the areas as a whole, instead of allowing each part to support its own activities at whatever level its own economic base will allow;

(3) When services can be supplied more efficiently through large-scale operations and when the advantages of large-scale operations are desired;

(4) When it is necessary in order to assure citizens a voice in decisions that affect them at their places of work and recreation as well as at their places of residence;

(5) When the "average citizen"--and this might be applied to school superintendents as well--feels a compelling need or an urgency for a major restructuring of the educational governmental pattern of his area.

The implication that inter-school district cooperation is necessary for the solution of most metropolitan-wide educational problems should seem clear at this point. Inter-school district cooperation will be needed to solve these crucial problems regardless of the organizational pattern used for educational government. Some degree of cooperation among independent school districts is necessary to cope with the multitude of educational and social problems facing the metropolitan area schools. If the organizational pattern of several independent school districts cooperating informally to solve common educational and social problems fails to meet the challenge and provide acceptable solutions, then the responsible leadership will seek new patterns and means for solutions. If metropolitan-wide educational government replaces independent districts as an organizational pattern, it too will require a high degree of cooperation in order to succeed.

---

[116] Luvern L. Cunningham, Chairman, "A Report to the Columbus Board of Education," Recommendations of the Ohio State University Advisory Commission on Problems Facing The Columbus Public Schools, June, 1968.

[117] Luvern L. Cunningham, Chairman, "Report on the Merger Issue," Unpublished report by a consultant team to the Louisville-Jefferson County, Kentucky Public Schools, 1966.

[118] Ralph D. Purdy, Director, "A Master Plan for School District Reorganization in Ohio," Project Staff School District Reorganization, The Ohio State Department of Education (Columbus, Ohio: The Department, 1966).

The establishment of an all-encompassing, metropolitan-wide governmental unit is a frequently advocated solution to overcoming the problems that are brought about by the fragmentation of governmental units in a metropolitan area. This proposition suggests that a metropolitan-wide government for education would be suitable under certain circumstances.[119] The most powerful role of the metropolitan educational district would be the financial role of procuring and allocating school support.[120] Perhaps such an organizational pattern would also enable a school district to procure better teachers and to improve instruction.[121]

In summary, little attention has been paid to inter-school district relationships within a metropolitan area; however, crucial educational and social problems have reversed this trend. There is an increase in the number of metropolitan educational studies, producing sometimes conflicting recommendations. Among these recommendations are the adjustment of school boundaries and the establishment of new forms of metropolitan educational government. The need for cooperation to solve these crucial social and educational problems has been made explicit in some studies and implicit in others. Resistance and conflict are implied also. Brechler stated that school districts are surrounded by invisible walls of constricting administrative boundaries and by girdles of district taxation that lead to a mutual frustration and selfish rivalry between neighboring districts in a metropolis.[122]

---

[119] Brechler, "Patterns of School District Interrelationships," p. 138.

[120] Cunningham, "Report on the Merger Issue," pp. 6-12.

[121] Leslie L. Chisholm, School District Reorganization (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1957).

Examples of Inter-School Cooperation

In 1962, Havighurst made a modest survey of a sample of standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA) to find out how much cooperation existed among school districts within a metropolitan area and how much planning there was for future cooperation. He found that in most instances several suburban school districts joined together for a specific service rather than attempting to secure this service through cooperation with the central city. In the great majority of situations, there was no cooperation among school districts in a metropolitan area, although a basis for such cooperation existed in several areas where there were regional school administrators' associations. Generally, results of the survey were negative and may be taken to indicate that there was not much actual area-wide cooperation.[123]

There are two types of cooperation among school districts--formal and informal. Formal relationships are those of a contractural nature, whereby the participants negotiate and apportion shares of costs and responsibilities for providing a particular service to some extent. Informal relationships are for the most part talking relationships that involve exchanging ideas and information on a whole series of topics, ranging from bureaucratic procedures to policy-making debates. Informal relationships tend to be the most commonly used. This type of relationship is popular because it is relatively easy to put into operation and there is little or no financial involvement.

---

[122] Brechler, "Patterns of School District Interrelationships," p. 14.
[123] Havighurst, Education In Metropolitan Areas, p. 150.

As an example of this kind of relationship, the Southeastern Michigan Association of School Superintendents has been meeting on a monthly basis to discuss common interests. According to a participating superintendent, meaningful discussions have been held on the topics of public employee negotiations and state financial support. Committees from this group have met with legislators, legislative committees and the governor.

A study by Brechler to determine the patterns of public school district interrelationships in the Kansas City, Missouri-Kansas Metropolitan Area revealed a great amount of ongoing cooperation among school districts in this metropolis.[124] The most frequently occurring type of cooperative effort concerned both specific curriculum matters, such as programming in special education and vocational education, as well as general curriculum concerns. There was also cooperation evident in relation to student problems, business practices and the availability of teaching personnel.

It was found in this study that informality is the chief characteristic of the relationships among districts as opposed to structured, formal mechanisms. It seems that the "professionalization" of school administrators provides the best explanation for the cooperation which exists. The "fraternalism" among administrators leads to the districts' involvement in cooperative activities.

---

[124] Brechler, "Patterns of School District Interrelationships," p. 14.

The Plan For Action By Citizens In Education (PACE)[125] was a program that grew out of the auspices of the Greater Cleveland Association Foundation. It led to a five-month study of Cuyahoga County school needs by a committee of citizens. The major recommendation of the committee was that the county superintendent's association, parochial school leadership, and an informal group of school board presidents launch a county-wide study of cooperative programs and services.

Examples of effective intermediate districts with cooperative action are found in several areas of Michigan and New York at the present time. The Oakland County Intermediate District at Pontiac, Michigan recently established a county-wide program to build four vocational-technical schools. Students from the individual county schools will spend half time in their local districts and half time in the vocational-technical schools. Prior to this activity, the intermediate district took leadership in the creation of a data processing center which makes possible the automation of business and record keeping in each of the member school districts. Student information is being programmed for the individual districts and programmers are in the process of developing flexible scheduling programs and a multiplicity of other programs which will assist the schools in the individual districts to develop individualized education. Planning is now in progress to develop a district-wide information retrieval system and a district-wide in-service program for teachers, as well.

In Lane County, Oregon, seventeen school districts formed a joint purchasing program. They prepared a catalog of items that were in greatest demand by the school systems and wrote a set of specifications for each item to be purchased.

---

[125] Havighurst, Education in Metropolitan Areas, p. 61.

Each school system submitted an order for the quantity of each item needed and bids were taken after the total order was prepared. This program proved to be a very effective means of economizing--the savings amounting to as much as fifty per cent on many items. Similar programs have been developed in Wayne County, Ohio, and Highland Park, Michigan.

The Omaha Metropolitan School District has special educational facilities for the physically handicapped and emotionally disturbed. The suburban school systems use the facilities of the central city on a cooperative basis and pay tuition to the city for the services rendered. Project AID (Assistance for Intercultural Development) is an effort on the part of the Omaha, Nebraska Board of Education to improve the quality of education for all students.[126] The project appears to be dedicated to the long-held, but seldom implemented principle, that equality of educational opportunity for all children, with reference to culture, economic, ethnic, religious or racial differences, is essential to the continued and vital growth of Omaha and as a basis for a free society.

Project AID academically and economically has brought to the deprived children of Omaha a chance to be successful. This was considered to be a vital factor by those responsible for developing the program. Because the entire community is involved, this program should succeed where many others fail. Omaha educators finally realized that if a child is to receive the type of education needed today, the community "curriculum" must be evaluated, modified, and changed whenever necessary. A bi-racial committee, selected by the mayor of Omaha, presented him with a series of proposals which the committee felt, if implemented, would go far in making their city a better place in which to live.

---

[126] "Assistance For Intercultural Development," Omaha Public Schools Bulletin, April 9, 1965.

AID is paying off. As a result of introducing this new program into the city, a pre-school program involving 225 children and 94 volunteers was created; the school dropout rate is showing a declining trend; the special education program has been revamped; and the interest of the community has increased markedly, as evidenced by P.T.A. attendance. The suburban school districts cooperate in this venture by sending those children who are physically handicapped and emotionally disturbed into Omaha. For this service, the suburban school districts pay tuition for these students.

Metropolitan Atlanta has a metropolitan school development council which employs a co-ordinator who works with three independent school systems and five county school systems.[127] A number of services are shared by the eight school systems, including in-service education, educational television, curriculum development, vocational education, and all programs for the education of exceptional children.

The Tulsa school district may be classified as a metropolitan district, since it includes large areas outside of the city limits. Two developments in recent years show promise for cooperative educational planning in the future--a metropolitan planning commission and county library system.[128] The metropolitan planning commission of Tulsa has planning responsibility for the whole area including five miles of territory outside the city limits. The citizens of the whole county approved the establishment of a county library system several years ago. Included will be a central library, a number of branch libraries in the towns, and an extensive bookmobile service to most parts of the county. These two developments are significant beginnings for joint educational planning in the future.

---

[127] Havighurst, Education in Metropolitan Areas, p. 61.
[128] Ibid.

The Nashville-Davidson County movement toward a metropolitan school organization involved the merging of a city and county school system to meet the demands and needs of a dynamic, changing population that was moving from rural to urban centers.[129] The situation before consolidation was one of continuous conflicts between the city and county school systems. In terms of contemporary educational practice, both systems were sub-standard with the public very much "up in arms" over the situation. Many people felt strongly that a change was needed. In 1961 the people of the Nashville community passed a charter to adopt a metropolitan government, and in August, 1962, a transitional Board of Education was organized to combine the two school districts into one. In 1964 the Metropolitan Board of Education assumed the responsibility of operating the new consolidated school system to meet the goals as defined by a one-year survey conducted in 1963.

The Learning Resources Center at Auburn, Alabama, an organization sponsored by Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is serving fourteen school districts from a seven county area.[130] The functions of this Center include computer-assisted administration, closed-circuit television, in-service training and audio-visual material repository.

A major form of metropolitan government which includes the school system is found in Dade County, Florida. The formation of this type of government began in 1955, but did not affect the structure of the school districts, as the system was already organized as a fiscally independent county unit. The significant change here was in the cooperation between the schools and other non-school government agencies. The indications to date are that cooperation between the school district and other government organizations has increased to the betterment of both the educational process and the benefits derived from other governmental agencies.

---

[129] Harris, et. al., "School Reorganization in a Metropolitan Area: The Nashville Experience," Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, pp. 352-382.

[130] L. W. Hughes, An Investigation of Functional Components of Central Facilities Serving Educational Cooperatives and Intermediate School Districts (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1968), pp. 50-65.

A somewhat different type of school district cooperation was attempted in West Virginia during the 1967-68 school year. The two school districts involved were Kanawha County and Randolph County. Randolph County is a very sparsely populated, mountainous area while Kanawha County is generally a heavily populated, industrial area. The two counties are separated by about 150 miles of mountainous terrain.

Pickens High School, a very small school in Randolph County housing grades one through twelve, was faced with the problem of not being able to provide a curriculum which would prepare its students for college. Through the efforts of interested parents and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (Charleston, West Virginia), a physics course, originating at George Washington High School in Charleston, was sent to seven students at Pickens High School via a telelecture and electrowriter hook-up. The project was financed completely by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory. The only expenditure by either school system was for necessary laboratory supplies. The experiment was designed to improve the curriculum in rural areas where consolidation was almost impossible due to geographical barriers.

The San Diego County Department of Education is a cooperative center that serves over 51 school districts ranging in size from San Diego Unified (city) district with an ADA of almost 140,000 to two one-room schools with an ADA of less than 15 each. This unit is a legal entity charged with the responsibility of providing educational leadership and service. The center is supported by state, county and local taxes, with additional funds for special programs from federal grants. The board of education has five members, each selected from one of the five districts into which the county is divided. The activities of this unit include curriculum coordination, pupil personnel services, audio-visual aids, library facilities, business services and special program services.

The Board of Cooperative Educational Services of Westchester, New York has been in operation since 1948, and now serves a total of 13 local school districts.[131] The districts served, located 30 to 45 miles away from New York City, are both urban and rural, and vary in student population from 1,000 to 7,050. The major financial support of this board is from the local districts, with special research project support coming from federal, industrial, or foundation funds. The functions of this unit include computer-assisted instruction and administration, mobile educational laboratory, in-service training, an audio-visual repository, special education programs, and vocational-technical education.

Examples of the creation of junior college districts, either through cooperative action of several school districts or by creation of special districts as a result of cooperative study by established school districts, are too numerous to mention. Whether such efforts take on special district status or remain a cooperative venture is generally dependent upon the financial structure of the state within which they are located.

The Educational Research and Development Councils of the Twin Cities

---

[131] Ibid., pp. 30-49.

Metropolitan Areas and the Greater Cleveland Area have taken a slightly different approach to achieving cooperation among school districts. In both cases, one of the primary motivating factors was the recognition of critical educational problems resulting from extremely rapid metropolitan growth. The educational leaders realized that the type of problems that developed in one area of a metropolis would eventually affect the entire area, and that each area was interdependent on the metropolis as a whole.

In 1966 the Twin Cities Educational Research and Development Council began to explore ways of providing coordinated and cooperative data-processing services. The project, funded by a Title III grant, assumed that the casual expansion of data-processing services in individual school systems lacked integration of processes. The purposes of the Center, established in 1967, included the provision of services, the development of application, the definition of cost-benefit relationships, the coordinated development of computer-assisted instruction applications, and in-service training for school personnel.

The Council encourages research relevant to the cause of education by the publication of notes on research problems, initiation and sponsorship of research projects, the consideration of support for research initiated outside the Council, and the publication of reports of research or annotated lists of research projects. The Council has provided a format for the discussion of instructional problems and curriculum improvement, and has developed various curriculum materials.

In the Boston metropolitan region, school districts are engaged in a cooperative project directed toward the promotion of quality integrated education.[132] The initial program was designed to be a first step toward solving the problems of de facto segregation in the Boston schools. The school systems of the area, whose leaders felt that a solution could be found to the racial imbalance in their school systems, formed an organization called the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity (METCO). The leaders of Project METCO were persuaded that a bussing of Negro children to the suburbs would not only help the Negroes of the inner city, but also the suburban whites who had been out of contact with children of other races to the detriment of their education and total development of both groups.

---

[132] Peter Schrag, Village School Downtown (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), pp. 140-150.

Financed by a grant from the U. S. Office of Education and a smaller grant from the Carnegie Corporation, METCO aimed at bussing about two hundred forty children from the slums to the suburbs during the 1966-1967 academic year. The children who volunteer for METCO are selected by the receiving school systems for their academic potential on the basis of scholastic records supplied by the Boston School Department. The children are bussed from Boston to the suburban communities and are returned at the close of the school day. In each suburb the child has a "second home" where volunteer families help handle emergencies, provide local social contacts, and attempt to develop a personal friendship with the child's parents. Some sources estimate that as many as three thousand ghetto children in the city of Boston were availing themselves of the opportunities of METCO in 1966, and that possibly another five thousand children were taking advantage of the open enrollment policies to attend schools outside of their own neighborhoods.[133]

---

[133] Conroy, "Hartford: A Case Study of Metropolitan Planning in Education," _Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education,_ p. 326.

The school systems of the Boston area have also undertaken another cooperative activity. Under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the government is financing the creation of large, regional education "laboratories." These laboratories will be devoted to experiment, innovation, and development, and will probably become major centers of educational power. The chances are quite favorable for further cooperation among school systems in this metropolitan area.

The Penta-County Joint Vocational School[134] is located in northern Ohio, close to the Toledo SMSA. This organization is composed of 19 school districts in five counties which decided to pool their resources and identities to form a regional vocational school district to offer specialized opportunities not previously available to students in their area. The district covers 1400 square miles and serves over one-half million people, but does not cooperate with the Toledo Public Schools.

The Purdy Commission in Ohio realized the many benefits to be gained from inter-school system cooperation, and recommended that area educational districts be created. These districts would be the machinery for the performance of activities which could be best accomplished on a large-scale basis. Some of the services which could be performed best on a cooperative basis include the following:

1. Curriculum development and improvement.
2. Special education.
3. Research and development centers and regional laboratories.
4. Advanced programs for the gifted.

---

[134] John L. Ramsey, "The Penta-County Story," Nation's Schools, LXXIX (September, 1966), pp. 16-19.

5. Services of specialists to teachers and administrators.
6. Processing of budgetary data for a service member district and related financial factors.
7. Centralized purchasing.
8. Data-processing computer technology.
9. Radio and educational television.
10. In-service education programs.
11. Statistical services.
12. Instructional media centers.
13. Coordination of programs and services with higher education.
14. Library coordination and services.
15. Coordination of programs and services such as health services, guidance services, attendance, counselor services, psychological services, and social worker services.
16. Coordination of programs and services with other governmental agencies---county, city, and local.
17. Legal services.
18. Advisory services to school boards.
19. Information and consultative services to the public.
20. Coordinating relationships with non-public schools.
21. Cooperative planning for area development.
22. Educational facilities: consultation and leadership for planning, construction, remodeling, coordination of maintenance, materials-testing service.[135]

---

[135] Purdy, "A Master Plan," pp. 130-131.

Resistance to Cooperation

The resistance factors to inter-school system cooperation must be considered in any complete discussion of the topic. Brechler found in his study of school district relationships that the "ideology of localism" seems to be perpetuated in school districts.[136] This ideology is rooted in the belief that local jurisdiction is inherently good, as opposed to an over-centralized, bureaucratized system of educational government.

Resistance to cooperative school ventures often represents a fragmentation of subcultures, ethnic groups, and socio-economic groups within the metropolitan areas. In fact, some would argue that it is the desire to be isolated into these sub-societies for purposes of residence and school attendance that has been a partial cause for the fragmentation of governmental units in the first place.[137] When such isolation occurs, people within each of the various sub-societies of the metropolis send their children to the schools in the districts that deliberately or unwittingly keep children from learning side-by-side with children from other sub-societies.[138]

Hooker states that:

> Future educational planning must give serious consideration to the coordinations of all efforts on the part of all school districts in the metropolitan area. Recognizing the strong localistic, home rule feeling that exists in certain school districts, particularly the affluent ones, it is time for the state legislatures to step in and reclaim some of the authority given to the local school district.[139]

---

[136] Brechler, "Patterns of School District Interrelationships," p. 156.

[137] Crouch, "Conflict and Cooperation Among Local Governments in the Metropolis," p. 60.

[138] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[139] Clifford Hooker, Van O. Mueller, and Donald E. Davis, "Cooperation Among School Districts in a Metropolitan Area: A Case Study," *Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education*, p. 350.

> The probability of legislative and judicial review of public school operations in the metropolitan areas increase in proportion to the inability and unwillingness of educators and boards of education to attack problems cooperatively.[140]

Conclusions

In viewing examples of metropolitan cooperation, Jacobson's comment is of particular import, for it suggests a problem.[141] In the literature reviewed and reported in this section of the paper, only vague generalities of good feeling about the results of cooperative endeavors were evident. Herein lies a potential danger in inter-school district cooperation---its lack of reliable evaluation. Where examples can be found, results are good only because those responsible for them say they are good. Too often educational ventures are planned by educators, implemented by educators, and evaluated by educators. Can such a process reveal the integrity of any such undertaking and provide creditable information for others to rationally risk similar ventures? It is vital, therefore, to include an evaluation component in any cooperative endeavor.

In conclusion, metropolitan school government or inter-school cooperation will not occur to any appreciable degree unless (1) school officials extend their thinking beyond their own school districts and become concerned for the educational welfare of all children, (2) professional and civic organizations openly express a desire to have a cooperative school government, or (3) there is legislative action that would force the school governments in a metropolitan area to become cooperative.

---

[140] Ibid., p. 351.

[141] Stanley Jacobson, "When School People Get Together," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV (May, 1965), p. 25.

CHAPTER III

A SURVEY OF METROPOLITAN COOPERATION IN OHIO

The increasing complexity of human life in metropolitan areas has inevitably resulted in increasingly complex networks of relationships among institutions and social agencies in every American metropolitan center. One of the purposes of this study was to develop information about the cooperative relationships of central city school systems with other schools and other non-school institutions and agencies in the nine Ohio metropolitan areas which were surveyed.[142] The limited nature of the survey would indicate that the data presented in this section should be interpreted as tentative and somewhat fragmentary. Nevertheless, the data provide a baseline dimension for gaining insight into the present state of inter-agency cooperation in major Ohio central city school districts.

Inter-Agency Cooperation

From a sociological point of view, the major business of any society is carried out by its various social systems. Sociologists have developed a number of social system taxonomies or classifications on which a survey of inter-agency cooperation might be based. The nature of this particular survey, with its focus on the public schools as the hub of these inter-system relationships, led to the development of six rather loose classifications of agencies or institutions with which school systems might be expected to work cooperatively. Two things should be noted before continuing -- (1) this list of six is not exhaustive of all social systems, and (2) the label "agency" has been adopted for the sake of convenience. The six agencies included in this survey are:

---

[142] Akron, Canton, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Springfield, Toledo, and Youngstown. The information presented in this survey is based on interviews with central city school superintendents and staff personnel in these metropolitan areas. No attempt has been made to survey the cooperative activities of the suburban school districts.

1. Government Agencies
2. Cultural Agencies
3. Health and Welfare Agencies
4. Church Agencies
5. Civic Agencies
6. Economic Agencies

Before turning to a brief description of the cooperative activity which is presently taking place between school systems and each of these agencies, it should be understood that most of these relationships occur on a relatively informal basis. Although occasional examples of formal cooperative activity based on written policy were uncovered, the great majority of the activity outlined below rests on a less formal base. In some cases, inter-agency cooperation may be simply the result of personal acquaintance between a school administrator and an administrator in a non-school agency; some examples of inter-agency cooperation reflect the personal interests of various leaders. Such relationships may or may not remain in effect as administrators accept new roles and agency personnel are replaced.

Inter-agency cooperation in the nine Ohio cities is summarized in Figure 1. The number of cities in which cooperation between the public schools and each specific agency was reported is indicated in the column labeled "Frequency."

Cooperation with Government Agencies

Seven of the nine school systems surveyed reported cooperation between the public school system and the city government. About half of the nine school

Figure 1

INTER-AGENCY COOPERATION: NINE CITY SUMMARY

Agency	Frequency*	Agency	Frequency*
GOVERNMENT		CHURCH	
City	7	Catholic Diocese	7
Courts	5	Council of Churches	3
Fire Department	5	Council of Jewish Women	1
Police Department	5		
Civil Defense	4		
Model Cities	4		
Pilot Cities	1		
State Patrol	1		
City Planner	1		
CULTURAL		CIVIC	
Recreation	8	Urban League	4
Museums	7	Civil Rights Groups	2
Symphony Orchestra	7	Junior League	1
TV Stations	5	Task Forces	1
Libraries	4	Bar Association	1
Newspapers	4		
Radio Stations	3		
HEALTH AND WELFARE		ECONOMIC	
Hospitals	7	Industry	7
Board of Health	6	Labor Unions	5
Family Service	6	Chamber of Commerce	4
Youth Agencies	6	Better Business Bureau	2
Employment Service	5		
United Fund	5		
Welfare Council	5		
Neighborhood Service	4		
Religious Charity	2		
Home-School	1		
Dental Service	1		

* - Number of school systems reporting cooperation with specific agency.

systems cooperate with the courts, the fire department, and the police department. Four school systems reported participation in the development of a Model Cities project. Participation in Model Cities planning varied from brief activity in the initial planning stages in one city to a rather intensive continuing involvement in another. One school system participates in cooperative activity with the Ohio State Highway Patrol. Only one of the nine school systems reported cooperation with the city planner.

Cooperation with government agencies may take the form of shared legal counsel used by both city and school district, joint planning for land purchase and site development, or the representation of the Office of the Superintendent on various planning committees. In one metropolitan area, the public schools cooperate with the county government in the purchase of various supplies.

Cooperation between school systems and police and fire departments generally takes the traditional forms. Police and fire officers assist in the instructional program and provide the necessary safety services for the school system.

Cooperation with Cultural Agencies

Eight of the nine school systems cooperate with local recreation agencies in the planning and implementation of recreational programs. Seven of the nine school systems have cooperative programs that involve local museums and symphony orchestras. About half the schools reported that cooperative relationships exist with local television stations, libraries, and newspapers. In three cities, cooperation with radio stations was reported.

Cooperation with museums and symphony orchestras normally involves special classes or performances for school children. The extent of these programs in individual cities appears to depend both upon the adequacy of the facilities and personnel in the cultural agency as well as on the interest which exists within the school system in making use of these agencies. Some public school systems make annual financial contributions to various local cultural agencies, while others provide joint programs on an individual fee basis. One school system reported a joint Title III project, developed in cooperation with a local museum.

Cooperation with mass media organizations may involve arrangements for emergency announcements, recognition of individual students and teachers, or special air time or newspaper space devoted to school affairs. In addition to this, of course, news of the school is reported as part of routine mass media activity.

Cooperation with Health and Welfare Agencies

More than half of the nine school systems surveyed reported cooperative relationships of one kind or another with local hospitals, boards of health, family service and youth agencies, employment services, and the United Fund. Some school districts also reported cooperative endeavors with neighborhood service groups and religious charities.

As might be expected, metropolitan school systems cooperate with a wide range of health and welfare organizations. In some cities, the avenues of cooperation are more formalized than in others. For example, in one city there is an area-wide welfare council to which all welfare agencies, many city government agencies, and the public schools belong. In some cities welfare agencies supply personnel to special programs such as Head Start. In one city, a local hospital has placed a nurse in an inner-city elementary school at its own expense to follow through on student health problems, while in another, school facilities are used by a hospital for nurses' aide training courses. Services for exceptional children are provided on a cooperative school-agency basis in a number of Ohio metropolitan areas.

Cooperation with Church Agencies

In seven of the nine Ohio metropolitan areas surveyed, public school administration reported cooperation with the local Catholic Diocese. Three school systems reported cooperative endeavors with the Council of Churches, and one school system reported a cooperative program with the Council of Jewish women.

In one area, local church groups have adopted several learning resource centers in elementary schools. Three school systems reported cooperative efforts with various local religious agencies directed to the passing of millage and bond issues.

Cooperation with Civic Agencies

Cooperation between public school systems and local civic agencies and organizations appears to be at a relatively low level. Four school systems reported joint endeavors with the Urban League and two reported cooperative activity with the local civil rights organizations. The schools are represented on various civic committees in some cities. In one area, the Junior League finances and administers a city welfare program under the direct supervision of the local public schools.

It appears highly possible that many instances of school-civic agency cooperation take place at the building level rather than at the central administration level, and have not been reported here. In at least one area it is the policy of the Board of Education that all administrative staff should work cooperatively with all civic and service organizations.

Cooperation with Economic Agencies

Various forms of cooperation between school systems and local industry and business were reported in seven of the nine cities surveyed. In addition, about half of the nine cities reported that cooperative ventures with the local labor unions and with the Chamber of Commerce exist. Two school systems carry on joint programs with the Better Business Bureau.

Many of the cooperative efforts which take place in this area have to do with vocational training and placement for both school children and adults. In at least one of the cities surveyed, vocational training and placement programming is very extensive. One school system reported that a local economic organization donated several thousand dollars to renovate an elementary school building. In another district, a citizens' advisory committee which includes representatives from the Chamber of Commerce, industry, and labor unions works with the public schools in an advisory capacity regarding urban school problems. On the negative side, one school system noted that it was experiencing poor relationships with local labor groups.

Inter-School Cooperation

Interviews of the superintendents and other staff personnel in the major city school districts of the nine SMSA's in Ohio revealed 29 different types of cooperation. According to the school superintendents of these districts, most of the cooperation that exists among the school systems is carried on informally, i.e., the cooperation exists with the knowledge of the board of education; however, the cooperation is carried on largely through informal administrative arrangements rather than written board policy. As one superintendent explained, "Formalizing a cooperative arrangement often retards its implementation." Superintendents seem to prefer the use of administrative policies for cooperative arrangements among school districts because administrative policies provide more flexibility, and enable the school district to test the desirability of the arrangement prior to making formalized board policy.

Figure 2 identified the 29 types of cooperation found in the nine school districts and includes the frequency of their appearance. An analysis of this table reveals a profile of cooperation. Over one-half of the districts cooperate in the areas of special, vocational, and adult education. A similar fraction of them also cooperate with institutions of higher learning and with the non-public schools. More than fifty per cent of the sample districts share their transportation and data processing facilities and equipment with other school districts, while roughly the same percentage of the school districts share their educational facilities and media, engage in metropolitan planning, and develop their curriculums cooperatively. About twenty per cent of the districts have developed joint programs in purchasing, in-service

Figure 2

INTER-SCHOOL COOPERATION: NINE CITY SUMMARY

Type of Cooperation	Frequency*
Special Education	7
Coordination with Higher Education	6
Adult Education	5
Coordination with Non-Public Schools	5
Data Processing	5
Transportation	5
Vocational-Technical Education	5
Curriculum Development	4
Educational Facilities	4
Educational Media	4
Metropolitan Planning	4
Centralized Purchasing	2
Driver Training Facilities	2
Guidance/Psychologist Services	2
Home Bound Education	2
In-Service Programs	2
Instructional Materials Center	2
Records Exchange	2
School Calendar	2
Summer School	2
Capital Outlay	1
Health Services	1
Public Information	1
Pupil Personnel Accounting	1
Research	1
Resource Center	1
Teacher Availability	1
Teacher Salary Schedules	1
Testing	1

* Number of school systems reporting cooperation with another school system.

training, and the organization of a school calendar. In addition, they share their facilities for driver education, summer school, and instructional materials centers. Cooperative arrangements in guidance/psychologist services, home bound education, and records exchange were also noted in approximately twenty per cent of the districts, while approximately ten per cent of the districts participated in cooperative arrangements dealing with teacher and pupil personnel, public relations, research, and finance.

The following discussion will attempt to describe more specifically the nature and characteristics of each type of inter-school cooperation. Each type of cooperation, included in Figure 2 will be mentioned, regardless of the frequency of its occurrence, but the most common types will be presented first.

Special Education. More of the districts sampled cooperate in the area of special education than in any other. Seven of the nine school districts have cooperative arrangements with other school systems, usually located within their county. Some of the special education programs are funded by Title III grants and some are operated on a tuition basis. Ohio school districts have received considerable recognition for their achievements with the emotionally disturbed and the deaf. As a result of their success in these areas, they have been asked to share their expertise and the curriculum materials which were developed because of it with other school systems and state departments of education throughout the nation.

Coordination with Higher Education. Two-thirds of the sample districts coordinate with institutions of higher education. Typically, the local school district provides a setting for the training of student teachers from a university, and the university reciprocates by waiving the fees for the district's teachers who wish to attend the university.

Adult Education. Approximately two-thirds of the sample districts offer adult education on a tuition basis to any adult wishing to enroll, regardless of his place of residence. One district permits only adult residents of its district to participate.

Coordination with Non-Public Schools. This type of cooperation is carried on in a variety of ways in most of the districts. For example, many public school districts share special education, vocational education, driver education, industrial arts, home economics, data processing, and athletic facilities with the parochial schools. In addition, the public schools provide transportation facilities for the parochial schools, as is required by law. In one instance, a public school shared its kindergarten facilities, health services, and guidance-psychological services with a parochial school.

Data Processing. Several of the sample districts share data processing facilities with county, parochial, and vocational schools. This cooperative service is usually used for processing schedules, student records, report cards, and payrolls.

Transportation. Five of the nine districts cooperate with the non-public schools by providing transportation, as is required by law.

Vocational-Technical Education. Two thirds of the sample districts cooperate with other school systems in providing vocational-technical education for their students. Sometimes these programs are jointly operated on a tuition basis, or in some instances, one school district operates the vocational program and the surrounding school districts contract for these services. If the funds are acquired by a county tax levy, the vocational program is usually available to all public and non-public school students who reside in the county.

Curriculum Development. Approximately one-half of the districts attempt to cooperate with one or more school districts in the improvement and development of curriculum. Administrators and teachers most often share curriculum materials and ideas in art, music, Black History, social studies, and reading. One school district shares an ESEA Title III Curriculum project with a nearly university. In some instances, personnel from one school system serve as resource persons for the development of curriculum in other districts.

Educational Facilities (Buildings, etc.) When parochial schools and community colleges share the educational facilities of public schools, the recipient sometimes pays rent for the use of the public owned facilities. Such an arrangement was found in almost half of the SMSA's surveyed.

Educational Media. Four of the school districts share educational television and radio facilities with the county schools, parochial schools, or suburban schools located in surrounding counties. In some instances, curriculum guides are provided and the surrounding schools pay for the use of the media.

Metropolitan Planning. This study revealed that many of the sample districts are attacking the problems of cooperative metropolitan planning. Typically, the superintendents or their representatives form a planning council and hold periodic meetings for the purpose of discussing cooperative solutions to common problems in transportation, special education, vocational-technical education, cooperative purchasing, data processing, extended school year, legislation and other items important to them in the administration of their respective districts. The development of the planning councils ranged from a few districts engaged in informal meetings to approximately thirty school districts financing a formal planning organization which employs an executive secretary to provide services for its members.

Centralized Purchasing. Approximately one-third of the sample districts engage in some form of cooperative purchasing practices with other school districts or with colleges and universities. Safety goggles, light bulbs, paper towels, and other small expendable items are typical of those which are jointly purchased.

Driver Training Facilities. Two school systems share their driver training facilities with parochial schools.

Guidance-Psychological Services. These services, which are almost always available in large metropolitan districts, are shared with the school systems that are too small to support an independent program of their own. The study revealed one example of the sharing of such services with parochial schools.

Home Bound Education. This cooperative enterprise occurred between parochial and public schools in only one instance.

In-Service Programs. A single school district operated a joint, in-service training program for personnel engaged in special education.

Instructional Materials Center. Only a small degree of cooperation was discovered in this area. Certain Title III instructional materials were being shared.

Records Exchange. In order to facilitate the transfer of students from one school system to another public or parochial school system, (usually located in the same county), school systems have engaged in a cooperative records exchange to expedite the distribution of student records and effect a smooth transition for the student.

School Calendar. Two school districts developed a school calendar in cooperation with county, public, and parochial schools.

Summer School. Summer schools have been operated cooperatively by two sample districts. The summer school program is open to all students of the surrounding area on a tuition basis. Teachers from all of the school districts serve as instructors for the summer school program.

Capital Outlay. One school district jointly owns a site on which is planned a future cooperative enterprise with another school system.

Health Services. One sample district reported that it shared its health services with the parochial schools in the district.

Public Information. One district cooperates informally with surrounding school districts by providing public relations materials and expertise in developing public relations programs. Materials related directly to the passage of financial issues have been of particular interest.

Pupil Personnel Accounting. One sample district cooperates with the local parochial schools in this area of administration.

Research. Research is a cooperative enterprise of one sample district and its surrounding school districts. The research information assembled is disseminated periodically to all of the participants.

Resource Center. One school system cooperates with several other school systems by sharing both the equipment and the materials from its resource center.

Teacher Availability. One of the school districts having an extensive personnel recruitment program provides information to the surrounding school systems about prospective teachers that they can not place in their own system.

Teacher Salary Schedules. Salary schedules are exchanged and discussed informally by one of the sample districts and its surrounding districts.

Testing. Testing services are shared with the parochial school system by one of the sample districts.

The investigations revealed a particularly unique type of inter-school cooperation--one which was being performed by public and non-public school students instead of their schools' administrators and teachers. In one school district these students formed an intra-city student council that met monthly to deal with problems common to all students in the city. The council had dealt specifically with such issues as a code of dress and conduct at sporting events.

In summary, the nine school districts sampled cooperate with their neighbors in a variety of ways and to various degrees. Most of the cooperation benefits the smaller school districts in that the arrangements enable them to give their students better programs and services than they could provide without the assistance of the larger district. At the same time, the smaller district is able to maintain its autonomy. However, the benefits of inter-school cooperation must not be construed as flowing in only one direction--from the larger to the smaller district; some of the cooperative enterprise also benefits the larger district. Data from these investigations indicate that public school boards and school administrators generally recognize the needs of the parochial schools and attempt to assist the parochial schools by engaging in several cooperative enterprises. Many of the problems facing school administrators cut across school district boundaries and require cooperative solutions, and the data seems to point out an awareness on the part of these administrators of the need to engage in joint planning and problem-solving activities.

CHAPTER IV

FIVE EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

A major purpose of the survey of inter-school and inter-agency cooperation presented in Chapter III was to gain some initial insight and understanding regarding the state of cooperative public school activity in nine selected Ohio metropolitan communities. A second purpose of the survey was to identify a small number of specific programs which appeared to be well developed and which might merit further investigation by the study team. Five such programs were ultimately identified and designated for further field study.

In the opinion of the study team, these five programs represent areas which are of particular relevance to education in the metropolitan context. They include the development of a Model Cities project; public school-social agency relationships; community-wide vocational planning; the community school; and cooperative working relationships between public and parochial schools. Within the scope of the present study, these programs may be fairly designated as exemplary. Each one represents the fullest development of its particular type that was encountered in the nine-city survey.

The five reports which comprise the remainder of this chapter were prepared by five separate field study teams. They are based on multiple interviews with officials and officers of school and non-school institutions and agencies in five of the nine Ohio cities encompassed by the survey. For the most part, the flavor of the original field reports has been preserved. It has been thought appropriate, however, to fictionalize city names for purposes of this presentation.

LONGSHORE: A MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

The Longshore Model Cities Program, in its present state of organization and development, is an exemplary approach to the problem of significantly improving the educational opportunities of a large number of children, and for simultaneously attacking, in a radical and comprehensive fashion, the ills of an urban ghetto.

It should be borne in mind that Model Cities Programs are relatively new phenomena of governmental intervention on the social scene. The inception of these programs is traced to the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, otherwise known as Public Law 89-754. The genesis of the Model Cities concept is the first Title of the Act, called Comprehensive City Demonstration Programs.

The preamble to Title One (Section 101) presents, with poignancy, the considerations which brought forth the legislation, and highlights clearly some of the social changes and related problems facing the schools and other institutions on a national scale:

> The Congress hereby finds and declares that improving the quality of urban life is the most critical domestic problem facing the United States. The persistence of widespread urban slums and blight, the concentration of persons of low income in older urban areas, and the unmet needs for additional housing and community facilities and services arising from rapid expansion of our urban population have resulted in a marked deterioration in the quality of the environment and the lives of large numbers of our people while the Nation as a whole prospers. (Public Law 89-754)

Basically, federal efforts to ameliorate the conditions outlined above through Title One of the Act are taking the form of experiments or innovative demonstrations aimed at developing workable methods for achieving the desired ends. The

Title provides resources for a new program designed to demonstrate how the environment and the general welfare of people living in slum and blighted neighborhoods can be substantially improved in cities of all sizes and in all parts of the country. It calls for a comprehensive attack on social, economic, and physical problems in selected slum and blighted areas through concentration and coordination of Federal, state, and local efforts. The Title provides for financial and technical assistance to enable cities to plan, develop, and carry out comprehensive local programs containing new and imaginative proposals to develop "model" neighborhoods.

The Longshore Model Cities Program officially came into existence late in 1967 when its first planning grant was received. Its first office was opened in January, 1968, at which time the organization became operative. Prior to the receipt of its first planning grant, a significant amount of groundwork had been laid for the development of the organization by an ad hoc committee made up of interested citizens and community leaders. It is the opinion of present Model City administrators that a cross-section of community leadership was active in the formative and early planning phases of the program. School, political, business, religious, and other general community interests were at stake. The outcome was a decision on the part of the city government, through its city manager, to establish eligibility and request assistance under the Law. Thus, the city of Longshore became the initiator of and a participant in a local effort which has received national acclaim for quality and organization--its Model Cities Program.

The objectives of all Model Cities programs are conditioned to a great degree by the direct legislation pertaining to them and numerous other social welfare acts. The basic thrust of Public Law 89-754 is directed toward solving problems of human and physical deterioration in urban areas. More specifically, action under Title I is to be directed at solving deep-rooted social and environmental problems of "model" neighborhoods. It is further mandated that within these neighborhoods the programs shall be comprehensive, concentrative, and forceful. Longshore chose to meet these requirements by picking a West-side neighborhood, predominately Negro, containing about 80,000 people, as its demonstration area. This section met all requirements of size, proportion, and boundaries. The broad objectives that were designed to meet the needs of this neighborhood and the requirements of the Act were as follows:

1. To physically rebuild or revitalize the large slum area.
2. To expand opportunities for adequate housing in reasonable price ranges.
3. To provide additional job and income opportunities.
4. To reduce dependency and welfare payments.
5. To improve educational facilities and programs.
6. To combat disease and ill health.
7. To reduce incidence of crime and delinquency.
8. To enhance recreational and cultural opportunities.
9. To provide adequate facilities for transportation.
10. To generally improve living conditions and environmental influences.

It should be noted that the objectives mentioned have been tailored to the needs identified as existing in the Longshore model neighborhood. They are quite comprehensive and almost all-inclusive. The three qualifications made by the Model City leaders when discussing the attainment of these goals are:

1. No priorities between stated objectives are recognized. Only priorities within an objective, needed to accomplish its fulfillment, will be recognized.

2. The major objectives are all related, one to another, and maximum benefits will accrue only if these relationships are recognized and kept uppermost in mind during planning and execution.

3. The common people must be consistently and meaningfully involved in planning, processing, and completing the objectives.

All grants by the Federal Government for Model Cities Programs are made to a City Demonstration Agency (CDA). The CDA in Longshore was established by the municipal government solvely for the purpose of administering the Model Cities Program.

According to the criteria set forth by the Federal Government, there should be a single administrative unit that can draw directly on the powers of the chief executive officer of the municipal government, under which the program is to be administered. The Model Cities Program in Longshore has satisfied these criteria by having a director, assistant director, and a director for the educational component.

The citizens of the Model Cities target area are represented administratively through the Model Cities Planning Council, which is composed of twenty-seven members. The target area is broken down into twenty-seven different areas, and each area has one council representative, elected by the citizens of that area.

The role that the Model Cities Planning Council (MCPC) is playing in the Longshore Model Cities Program is considerably different from that in most cities. In Longshore, the citizens offer valuable input into the planning process by being represented in the decision-making process at the "grass roots" level. The Model Cities Program is being planned by the people who live in the target area, under the direction and supervision of the administrative officers of the CDA. This program is actually being planned and carried out by the people and for the people in the target area, an aspect which alone makes the Longshore Model Cities Program an exemplary one.

The MCPC in Longshore has entered into an agreement with the city government whereby they become "equal partners" with the city. The arrangement gives the MCPC just as much power in the decision-making process as the city commissioners have in matters that concern the citizens of the Model Cities target area. At the present time an attempt is being made to reach a similar agreement with the board of education, however, State law does not allow the board to delegate authority to any other agency. The superintendent of schools has offered the skills and resources of all departments of the school board, as well as a willingness to cooperate with MCPC.

The administrative unit of the CDA will develop its organizational capability so as to plan and carry out a well-coordinated, comprehensive plan and to engage in continuing planning and evaluation during the implementation period. During this planning period cities are expected to submit a "Problem Analysis Goals and Program Strategy Statement." Following, are the steps to be taken according to the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development:

1. Cities will collect additional data and re-examine and further develop their problem analyses.
2. Goals will be defined and adjusted on the basis of the more detailed problem analyses and the continuing participation of diverse groups and individuals, particularly neighborhood residents.
3. Program strategies will be developed and priorities will be assigned.
4. Program approaches will be developed resulting in the delineation of the specific projects and activities necessary to meet the needs in the Model Neighborhoods.
5. The strategies and priorities will be reflected in the scheduling of projects and activities.

In attempting to fulfill the requirements set forth by the Federal Government, the Longshore CDA has already become involved in many programs and activities in which citizens in the target area often had the leading role. These programs and activities include Early Childhood Education (ECE), Community Schools Council (CSC), National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB), and the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP).

The ECE program is concerned with the education of three- and four-year old children. The program will probably be operated much like a day-care program, so that the mothers of many of these children will be able to work while their children are at school.

The CSC consists of six parents, the school principal, community-school director, two teacher-representatives, and, in the case of high schools, a person appointed by the student council. The council is to encourage citizen participation in helping to identify the educational needs of the community and to assist in the planning and evaluating of educational programs.

The NAB has begun to hire and train those who were considered unemployable by traditional standards. Business organizations are helping finance the local OIC (Opportunities Industrial Center) by investing from $100, 000 to $150, 000 per year.

The CEP is concerned with providing part-time jobs for school dropouts who have been unsuccessful at finding employment. These students are taken to a training center in Longshore where they get some classroom instruction while they work part-time. The program is aimed at helping to eliminate the drop-out problem.

The Federal Government will provide up to eighty percent of the funds necessary to plan and implement a Model Cities Program. The remaining twenty percent must be secured locally.

The Longshore Model Cities Program could cost up to $250, 000, 000 over a five-year period. The Federal Government has approved funds totalling $63, 000 to allow the Community School Councils to begin operation. The resources offered by the Federal Government are almost entirely in the form of financial aid.

The local community has provided valuable resources, both physical and financial. The universities in the area and the business organizations have given their time and talents to help the CDA with system analysis and also with placing the CDA on a planned program of budgeting.

Financial institutions have made sizeable loans to individuals in the target area for the purpose of setting up a business operation. Low-income families are now able to get small loans at low interest rates for such purposes as home improvements and purchasing automobiles. Some of the more affluent Negroes have pooled their financial resources to open a bank in the target area.

It is hoped that religious organizations, as well as industrial organizations, will begin to invest large sums of money to be used for low-cost loans to low-income families.

In assessing the Model Cities Program, the accomplishments experienced, as well as the problems encountered, will be discussed. The perceptions of the persons who participated generally indicated that there was an optimum mix of people involved in the Model Cities Program from its most embryonic stage. The citizens' group from the city-at-large exhibited a high capability in the initial planning, and the inclusion of representatives from the ghetto proved to be a genuine asset. All concerned soon found that the people from the ghetto had sound ideas which they wanted to contribute. Not only were the people from the ghetto invited to participate and contribute; they were heard! Furthermore, their wishes and concerns were used in the planning. As a result, they felt they had something to do with a planning process that would directly affect their lives.

Throughout the planning process a concerted effort was made to create an optimum mix of people and resources. This optimum mix might be better described as an equilibrium between people and resources. The people involved in the planning phase of the Longshore Model Cities Program felt that once this equilibrium was reached the program began to move ahead.

Many of the people involved in the planning for the Model Cities Program were relatively young and energetic, with considerable technical training. The city staff and city manager have also been praised for the progressive attitude and professional expertise they have brought to the planning process.

Another unique feature of the Longshore Model Cities Program is the Model Cities Planning Council, the first of its kind in the Nation. Even more unique is the relationship this citizens' group has with the City Commission--in matters pertaining to Model Cities this group has an equal partnership with the city, formalized by resolution.

The relationship of the business and industrial community to the fledgling Model Cities Program has been cooperative, but merely a good relationship does not go far enough in helping to bring about the changes that are needed. A commitment of basic financial resources is required to bring the proposed programs to realization. The officials of the Model Cities Agency have been working with the business and industrial community in an effort to show them how they might become involved. It became apparent that although the men in business and industry had considerable professional acumen, they did not have the experience or knowledge as to how to become involved in a program of this type.

The business community is beginning to feel that the Model Cities Program has stabilized, and, as a result, it is becoming more willing to commit substantial amounts of capital to the ghetto. The lending institutions are also beginning to "open-up" so that it is now easier for ghetto residents to borrow money to purchase homes.

In addition, many of the industries and businesses are becoming less rigid in their employment standards and practices. Until the formation of the National Alliance of Businessmen and the involvement of some larger employers, the employment standards throughout Longshore were rather rigid, and adhered strictly to the use of tests and educational experience as the requirements for employment. Today, the ghetto youth has a much better chance of being employed due to the elimination of some of these barriers.

The school system played an important role in the development of the Model Cities Program due to the efforts of an assistant principal who became quite concerned with the problems of educating the youth of the Longshore ghetto. Fortunately, there were people on the Model Cities Planning Council who shared his concern, and they requested that the Board of Education loan this man to the Planning Council to help in the development of the educational component. Instead of requiring this assistant principal to return to the school to which he had originally been assigned, an agreement was reached whereby the Board of Education would loan him to the Model Cities Organization for as long as he was needed.

It is generally agreed that the Board of Education supports the recommendations of the Superintendent. This may be attributed directly to the fact that people recently elected to the Board are interested in the Model Cities Program and wish to see it succeed.

The future outlook for the Model Cities Program in Longshore is optimistic. It is felt that the program has had an immediate, positive, uplifting effect upon the people of the neighborhood through the creation of an atmosphere of hope and the feeling that someone really cares about them.

From all indications, Longshore has developed the type of program that stimulates personal involvement and widespread commitment from all sectors of the city. The citizens of the ghetto have become a part of their own destiny, rather than allowing an outsider to impose a pre-packaged program upon them which does not fulfill their wide variety of existing needs.

SPACE CITY: THE SCHOOLS WORK WITH SOCIAL AGENCIES

A survey team visited Space City for the expressed purpose of investigating the level of cooperation that exists between the school system and other community agencies. An initial interview with the superintendent of schools led to the selection of several cooperative efforts which merited further investigation. These consisted of (1) several facets of the relationship between the city government and the schools, (2) two projects involving the business community and the schools, and (3) a federation of community agencies.

It was evident from the treatment received by the survey team that a spirit of cooperation existed among Space City school personnel. The superintendent of schools and other administrators were more than willing to provide the team with all pertinent information requested. The administrative assistant to the superintendent arranged for the team to interview those members of the administrative staff who were responsible for the various efforts in which the survey team was particularly interested.

The investigation of the cooperative efforts between the city government and the schools focused on four areas of significant activity: (1) the working relationship between the mayor and the superintendent of schools, (2) community relations, (3) educational facility planning, and (4) recreation. Those interviewed stated that there has always been some cooperation taking place between Space City Public Schools and the city government. However, the extent of the cooperation was not very significant, with no one going out of his way to increase the effectiveness of such efforts. This is not the case today. The survey team discovered an excitement in Space City that pervaded every department in the school system as well as the municipal offices. This new dedication and determination to make it a dynamic, viable city is being guided by a unique partnership that has evolved between the mayor and the superintendent of schools. Everyone interviewed by the survey team postulated that the quality of cooperation that permeated the city was due to the fact that the mayor and the superintendent recognized that they must combine forces and give each the greatest possible support.

Shortly after the present mayor was elected, he and the superintendent began to confer frequently about the most pressing problems in Space City. These conferences dealt with the problems related to their respective organizations and how closer cooperation between their respective offices could mutually benefit the people. Many such conferences were held, particularly at the superintendent's breakfast gatherings. As a problem was identified by the mayor and superintendent, a team of key administrators was assigned to jointly develop a plan of action.

The allocation of resources, both financial and personnel, was determined by assessing the nature of the problem and then assigning it to the department in either the city government or the school system that was best suited to handle it. Seldom does money change hands as each organization agrees to pay a predetermined share of the cost, and personnel are assigned as needed.

The following are some examples of what has been accomplished and what is being planned as a result of the mayor and superintendent cooperating:

1. The city council turned over fifty-five acres of land to the board of education to be developed for recreational and educational use. The board of education will assume the mechanical and maintenance costs.

2. The city and board of education are jointly sponsoring the erection of seven new recreation centers, three to be paid for by the city and three by the board of education. The seventh center will be attached to the James Hamilton High School and will be financed by the board of education. The city will reimburse the board of education in 1970, when bond money will be available. Such cooperation has a dual thrust: (a) it saves tax dollars by not duplicating facilities and (b) it makes schools legitimate community centers which can be open 14-16 hours per day, every day.
3. By constructing school buildings on urban renewal property, the city realizes double the input of construction cost in terms of federal tax credits. The city is then able to use such credits to acquire additional land which can be developed for the benefit of the citizenry.
4. The city and board of education are promoting the construction of a high school in the downtown area which would be totally comprehensive in curriculum offerings, with a diversity in racial grouping and academic abilities. This particular school will be within walking distance of Space City State University, and would be used as a teacher training center. The faculties of both institutions would have joint appointment responsibilities.

Needless to say, problems are also created when such cooperative ventures are proposed. Most of the problems encountered are generally solved by the persistence of the cooperative efforts generated by the personnel involved. The two problems that seem to be most prevalent are:

1. the hesitancy displayed by those employees imbued with the traditional non-cooperative attitude, and
2. the ever present condition found in all metropolitan areas; a lack of sufficient funds and personnel.

The mayor and the superintendent are perceived by their subordinates, based on information obtained by the survey team, as being very supportive. This support has engendered a willingness on the part of these individuals to develop new cooperative techniques. These leaders are seen as being flexible, forward thinking, and not hindered by tradition. They possess the sensitivity to deal effectively with all elements of the social world in which they function; the business, industrial, political, and educational communities.

It was quite evident to the survey team that the level of cooperation between the school system and other municipal agencies has been raised considerably, and that the successes experienced so far, future experiences, and the cooperative nature of all employees is dependent upon the leadership qualities displayed by the mayor and the superintendent.

An interview with the chairman of the department of community relations in the city government and the highest ranking assistant superintendent of schools revealed that a number of cooperative activities are also presently occurring between the city and the schools in the area of community relations. These officials contend that this cooperation is related to the high level of cooperation between the superintendent of schools and the mayor.

The objectives of the current cooperative efforts are (1) to build lines of communication from communities to both the city government and the schools in order to establish dialogue with all involved communities, and (2) to improve the effectiveness of the services of the city and the schools in meeting the needs of the communities.

Currently, no formal agreement directs the combined efforts toward reaching the common objectives. The director of community relations, a member of the mayor's cabinet, is assisted by a staff of ten community directors. The community relations function in the schools is conducted under the coordination of central office personnel and involves both central office and building level personnel.

A number of activities in the communities have been initiated under the broad context of the cooperative atmosphere. The mayor and his cabinet have held meetings in school facilities to provide an opportunity for the community citizens to be heard. The problems discussed have related to a variety of interests. Those relating to dissatisfaction with the schools have frequently been included.

On several occasions the school board requested the city's community relations personnel to assist them in problem areas. On another occasion the city's community relations personnel undertook, on their own initiative, a study of situations relating to the schools. In these missions, the city's task force attempted to discover the answers to a number of questions. What are the real facts of each situation? Are they the same as the facts which appear in the news media? What are the real issues? Who are the leaders and do they represent a substantial number of the community? Are these leaders from inside the community or from outside? When these questions were answered, the city's task force forwarded the analysis to appropriate school personnel to assist in establishing dialogue between the leaders of the community and school officials. The task force also arranged meetings of the two groups in the community where the difficulty occurred.

The schools have also cooperated with the city in permitting the director of community relations to use the school facilities without charge for meetings with the various factions within the black communities, even though the particular issues did not relate directly to schools.

There are no direct monetary appropriations for the cooperative efforts. Each organization provides financial and personnel appropriations for those tasks designed to achieve common goals.

The director of the city's community relations task force believes the task force is well received by both the community and the schools in their community relations work. He contends there is a general recognition on the part of both the schools and the city that the issues involved in community relations are not clearly divisible into school and city problems. He believes that neither the schools nor the city is adequately prepared to deal with the problems.

The director further stated that the schools and the city should develop a more formal cooperative procedure, preferably on a continuing basis, but at least for crisis experiences. However, he contends that continued cooperation is quite likely so long as the current leaders of the two institutions are in office.

A third facet of the cooperative efforts between the city and the schools is in the area of facility planning. Personnel in the office of city planning and the school administrative personnel who are most directly related to school facility planning have focused upon certain common problems in recent years. Currently a considerable degree of cooperation exists between these two task forces.

Upon formation of a joint recreation planning council in 1946, opportunities for cooperation between the schools and the city planning office were increased. However, the cooperative activities of the two planning groups has been only token until recent years. Other than providing recreational facilities, an area in which the joint recreation planning council has been instrumental in bringing the city and the schools together, school personnel have tended to ignore the city planning department in developing school facilities. Only since the beginning of the terms of leadership of the current mayor and superintendent has the level of cooperation between these two groups become significant.

The more general objectives of the current cooperative efforts relate to the more efficient use of community resources. Conscious effort is made to avoid contradictory moves by the relatively separate institutions. The desire to provide a complete, balanced program of public services is another goal of cooperation.

There is no central governing body that combines the functions of the personnel responsible for planning in the two institutions. However, there are several factors in the organization of the city planning office which tend to encourage cooperation. The charter of the city requires all public agencies to refer their building plans to the city planning commission for study followed by either approval or rejection. Moreover the city charter provides that any public agency can overrule the action of the city planning office by a two-thirds majority of the governing body of the agency. Although this fact provides encouragement for cooperation, past experience has shown that it is not enough. The president of the board of education is currently a member of the city planning commission, which provides additional impetus for cooperation. The general relationship between the leaders of the city and the schools, however, appears to be the most positive force in the present cooperative relationship.

The area of cooperative activities between the city planning office and the schools relates primarily to the selection of sites for school facilities. Planning involving the recreation departments of the city and the schools, under the auspices of the joint recreation planning council, has resulted in the location of a number of the facilities so as to supplement each other.

The cooperative activities of the schools and planning departments of the city have been fruitful in developing plans for providing school facilities on urban renewal sites. Attention has focused on providing the entire range of school facilities throughout the city. The two agencies work together from the beginning of a location project and share information.

The building program has increased rapidly during the term of the present superintendent of schools as a result of the passage of a major bond issue for the improvement of school facilities. To date, most of the cooperative activities have related to physical facility planning and very few to social planning and the educational implications of social planning.

Resources for the cooperative efforts are funded by each organization. These generally consist of expenditures for salaries of the personnel involved.

The members of both groups interviewed stated that the cooperative efforts in recent years have been satisfying and have resulted in a more coherent plan for serving the needs of the entire community as well. According to these members, past experience would indicate that unless the present level of cooperation is formalized and organized to a greater degree than it is currently, the gains of recent years could be lost rather rapidly.

There is a general optimism among the members interviewed, which included an executive of the city planning office and the director and the assistant director of the recreation program of the schools. These officials see cooperation occurring primarily within the existing organizational structure, since it is not likely that organizational changes will be made in the immediate future.

The final facet of the investigation of cooperative efforts between the city and the schools focused on the area of recreation. The survey team interviewed the Supervisor of Physical Activities, an employee of the board of education who is responsible for the recreational program.

In 1946 the city government and the board of education established a joint council responsible for planning and implementing a city-wide recreation program. The council was initiated by the law director and the president of the board. Prior to this time, the city and board of education were conducting separate and consequently duplicatory programs.

The original board of directors was city controlled, with seven members, as compared to three for the board of education. In 1951, the council was reorganized, with the city having six members--the mayor, law director, finance director, park director, and two councilmen. The board of education also had six members--the president, superintendent of schools, clerk-treasurer, business manager, and two other board members. The president of the local social agency federation, a neutral body, was designated chairman of the council. The city recreation director and the supervisor of physical activities were appointed co-ordinators of the program.

Certain responsibilities have been divided between the two departments to facilitate the development of a quality program. For example, the city recreation department is responsible for implementing the entire football, baseball, softball, and beginning swimming programs, whereas the board of education recreation office is responsible for handicraft, table games, puppetry, choral groups, and other sports activities. The portable swimming pool program, which is financed through Title I funds, is under the direction of school personnel because of guidelines governing the use of such funds.

An employee of the board of education is the general supervisor of all playgrounds in the city; another board employee is responsible for hiring all recreation personnel, with the exception of district supervisors, who are assigned by the city recreation director, supervisor of physical activities or the general supervisor of playgrounds. The practice of hiring all personnel through one office has established one standard of employment and one salary schedule for all personnel.

In the area of financing, all monies remain in separate accounts but cooperative decisions are made between the recreation director and the supervisor of physical activities as to which department will purchase what supplies and equipment. Such an arrangement has resulted in significant savings of tax funds. Recreational employees are carried on the payroll of the division that owns the center where they are employed. For example, a board of education employee working at a center owned by the city is paid by the city. The director of physical activities was asked to discuss the significance of this type of merger. He indicated that:

1. Duplication of effort has been eliminated, resulting in a better program for the entire city.
2. A more comprehensive planning program has resulted along with a more detailed evaluative process.
3. All areas of the city will have swimming pools adjacent to the high schools. A program of such magnitude would not have been possible without city-board of education cooperation.

4. The major concern now is program improvement rather than inter-department credit seeking.
5. A significant saving in tax dollars is realized by using the same area for educational and recreational purposes.
6. Recreational centers and schools are strategically located, so as to be more accessible to all citizens.

It is only natural that a cooperative venture of such proportions would experience difficulties. The supervisor of physical activities indicated that this type of program was sometimes hampered by the following situations:

1. Conflicting personalities of the directors of the two departments.
2. Abusing school facilities to the extent that they are not usable for educational purposes.
3. A breakdown in the network of communication between departments at all levels.

The establishment of a single recreation program, jointly conducted by the city and the board of education, has resulted in a greater variety of activities to meet the needs of Space City citizens. Such a program has meant that the quality of offerings has been increased substantially at a lower cost in tax dollars.

In the investigation of cooperative efforts between the city and the schools, the survey team found a significant degree of cooperation in all four areas investigated: (1) mayor and superintendent, (2) community relations, (3) educational facility planning, and (4) recreation. Only the joint program in recreation is formally organized. According to the personnel interviewed, cooperation in the other areas is primarily the result of the desire of school and city personnel to cooperate.

The investigation of cooperative efforts between the schools and other social agencies also focused on activities between the schools and the business-industrial community. The investigation included two projects, the first being the vocational program for high school students in the city.

According to the director of vocational-technical education, the superintendent is very much concerned about what happens to a student when he graduates from high school. It is his opinion that "general education" serves no useful purpose and that a graduating senior should be moving in either one of two directions--to a job and possibly more education or directly into higher education.

According to the director of the vocational department, in 1963, a survey of high school graduates was conducted in an effort to determine just how relevant the present curriculum was in meeting student needs. The results of that survey were somewhat alarming to school personnel. Only thirty per cent of the graduating seniors moved directly into higher education, and thirty-five per cent could not find immediate employment. However, almost one hundred per cent of those graduates who were vocational education majors and did not go on to higher education found employment. It became apparent to all concerned that significant curriculum changes were necessary.

In 1964, there were forty vocational education classrooms in Space City, principally in two schools. As a consequence of student needs, there are presently over 246 vocational education classrooms, with programs provided in all city high schools. Space City has the largest vocational agriculture program in the state and one of the largest in the country. This program, like other aspects of the vocational education program, is based upon the urban ethic and strives to prepare students to live and work in the urban setting.

As the board of education expanded the vocational education program, they recognized that they had to accept some responsibility for providing employment opportunities. The school system entered into a comprehensive cooperative agreement with the business community to provide part time working opportunities for students, in order to provide them with practical, on the job experience as they moved toward graduation and, hopefully, assured employment.

More than four hundred employers are now cooperating with the school system in providing work experiences for vocational education trainees. The city government has given the board of education 55 acres of land, a part of which will be used to train high school students in vocational horticulture. The high schools are being air-conditioned so that more students can avail themselves of the services offered by the vocational education department.

There has been and continues to be a shortage of trained professionals in the building trades, such as carpenters, electricians, masons, and sheet metal workers. The board of education, in an effort to provide students with a broad expanse of occupational possibilities, has entered into an agreement with the Construction Employers Association. The Association provides printed literature describing all trades to the libraries of all schools and in the guidance offices of all high schools. Workmen, skilled in various trades, are being sent to two junior high schools to demonstrate their skills and provide information relative to the training program. If this program is successful, it will be expanded to include other schools.

The results of school-business cooperation has been very encouraging. Ninety-three per cent of the January, 1967 class who were seeking employment were placed in jobs. Space City employers hired ninety-four per cent of the

June, 1967 seniors planning to seek employment. This represents 801 of the 847 high school graduates who were not planning to go on to higher education, or enter the military. .

A program of such magnitude is more than likely to run into problems. One difficulty in establishing such a program, according to the program director, lies in the lack of understanding of school personnel not directly associated with vocational education. A high degree of cooperation is necessary, for the introduction of a comprehensive vocational program into a high school means that some fundamental changes must be made, particularly in the area of class scheduling. The second major problem centers around the desire of most parents to send their children to college, though the majority of high school graduates do not enter higher education. Consequently, a program to educate the public relative to the importance of vocational education is paramount.

In planning for the future, the director of technical-vocational education envisions a broadening of the relationship established between the business community and the board of education, to provide more opportunities for students. Such a program, in his opinion, is essential to the continued growth of the metropolitan area.

The second project dealing with cooperation between the schools and the business-industrial community relates to the development of a vocational education program for high school dropouts. The survey team met with the manager, who gave the following reasons for organizing the program:

1. The social unrest in the inner city.
2. A need in the business and industrial communities for a well trained work force.

3. A need for a non-threatening training center for the dropout and the improperly educated.
4. The realization on the part of the board of education that additional training beyond high school is needed.

The center is housed in a former factory given to the board of education by a major manufacturing firm for the expressed purpose of training Space City residents for meaningful occupations. The center, according to the manager, is organized in such a way that it will blend the cooperative efforts of as many agencies as possible to confront those social problems plaguing the metropolitan area. This coordinated effort saves funds, makes greater use of personnel, and keeps agencies from "plowing the same ground." For example, the state bureau of employment, which is located in the center, is responsible for recruiting all employees for the business and industrial community.

The center, which is jointly sponsored by the board of education and the chamber of commerce, concentrates on five areas of employment:

1. Job development--designing and developing training programs for business and industry.
2. Recruiting--bringing together prospective employers and employees, including those not being trained at the center to satisfy a mutual need.
3. Training--providing prospective employees with the academic and technical skills which will make them employable; also providing business and industry with personnel trained in specific areas.
4. Placement--assisting a graduate of the center in locating suitable and acceptable employment.

5. Follow-up--providing continuous guidance and counseling for graduates after they have obtained a position.

The center receives financial aid through the board of education from those businesses that are cooperating in the development of the program. A non-profit organization, Woodmere Interprises, acts as an intermediary between the board and industry. This organization establishes contractual arrangements with industry to hire and train workers before they are placed on industry payrolls. This practice benefits industry, unions, and the workers.

The most significant problems experienced thus far are as follows:

1. Board of education are not accustomed to responding to needs as rapidly as industry.
2. There is a lack of the equipment and facilities needed to do the best job of training personnel.
3. There is insufficient planning time available prior to bringing people in to train them for specific positions.
4. Archaic laws on the books that are no longer relevant are a hindrance to the program.

Future plans include a greater consolidating of services to citizens, consequently less fragmentation; diversifying the training program to include more skill areas; and obtaining the latest equipment used in business and industry for training purposes.

In both of the programs of vocational education investigated, the survey team found activities which provide evidence of cooperation between the schools and the business-industrial community. In the program for high school dropouts the cooperative efforts were more formally organized.

The investigation of cooperative efforts in the metropolitan area also focused on the contribution of the federation of community agencies. The most formally organized of all the cooperative efforts, the Federation of Community Agencies, is an association of agencies and institutions primarily in the fields of health, welfare, and recreation. The federation is composed of 225 member organizations, of which the city schools are one of 138 non-financially participating members. The geographic area served by the federation includes the city, its suburbs, and contiguous semi-urban areas.

The antecedents of the present federation were two previous organizations. One was a federation of the city's private charities, evolved under the aegis of the Chamber of Commerce for joint fund-raising when leading citizens decided a federated effort would be more efficient.and economical, and would result in more adequate support. The second was a welfare council. In 1917, a merger of the two formed the present federation.

The federation has three primary functions: (1) community planning, (2) budgeting United Appeal Funds to financiall participating organizations, and (3) providing technical, professional, and coordinating services to member organizations.

A representative body composed of two members elected from each of the 240 member organizations constitutes the overall governing body. The primary function of this body is to establish a board of trustees which has the legal and financial authority to act in the name of the organization. Currently some of the members of the board of trustees are elected by the representative assembly and some are ex officio members, among them the president of the board of education and the superintendent of schools. The federation is a non-governmental organization. The board of trustees has employed an executive director and a staff to direct the program of the federation.

Numerous activities exist whereby the federation attempts to achieve its objectives. With respect to the planning function, it is currently working on such problems as mental retardation, chronic illness, juvenile delinquency, public welfare financing, child welfare, and public health. The schools are involved in these activities in a number of ways. The federation budgets and disseminates United Appeal funds to financially participating agencies. Among the thirty central services to agencies are bookkeeping and auditing for financially participating agencies, and volunteer recruitment, research and public relations for all member agencies. Since the particular emphasis of this study is the cooperative efforts between schools and other social agencies, only those activities pertaining to the topic will be further discussed.

In the recent past, a "Health Goals Study" for the community was undertaken by the health planning and development commission of the federation. Subsequent to this study, a committee was organized to create a format for increasing the emphasis on family life education, with school personnel playing an active role in it. The schools were then given the format as a guide for implementing the program.

In conjunction with the five-year project on mental retardation, under the auspices of the federation, facts were gathered and goals identified for developing work-study programs in the public schools to help prepare the educable mentally retarded for jobs. Emphasis was placed on the needs of the inner city. The schools, having worked closely with the study committee, assumed the task for developing an appropriate program.

A project recently undertaken, dealt with community use of school facilities and involved the metropolitan housing authority, the city recreation department, the schools, and the federation. There is a conscious desire on the part of all of these agencies to establish multiple function centers in the ghetto areas of the city. The role of the school facilities in meeting the physical plant needs of these programs is currently in the process of being identified and shaped.

The manpower planning and development commission of the federation cooperated with the schools, the industrial leaders, and social workers in a project in which the problem of high school dropouts was studied. Members of the study group toured exemplary programs in several cities throughout the United States. The results of the study were utilized by the board of education in developing their general vocational education program and the vocational education programs discussed in the preceding section of this report.

School health personnel also cooperated with the health commission of the federation in studying city health needs and metropolitan health problems as they related to the schools. A number of the community agencies, including the schools, used the results of the study in developing and improving their programs.

The executive director of the federation and the highest ranking assistant superintendent of schools both report a good relationship between the schools and the federation. This relationship has led to a number of less formal cooperative efforts in the last several years. The executive director reported that on several occasions, when particular problems have arisen between the schools and various local community groups, the director, the president, and several other members of the federation met with the superintendent of schools at breakfast to explore how the federation could be of assistance to the schools in improving deteriorating relationships between the schools and the neighborhood groups. As a result, a meeting was organized between the heads of the neighborhood center associations and the superintendent of schools. This was a positive step toward establishing lines of communication between the dissenters and the schools.

A special project was recently undertaken, the proceeds of which were designated to purchase shoes for needy school children in the city. Since the federation is a private organization and donations are subject to tax deduction, it was chosen to handle the funds for the project.

The director of the federation also indicated that members of the administrative staff of the federation support the bond issues and levies which the school system presents to the voters. There is no formal program related to this task, however.

Funding for the federation is from three primary sources: United Appeal, foundation grants, and general donations. The federation itself does not assess fees for its services.

The federation serves as a symbol of the community's interest in the total needs of citizens in the combined metropolitan area, and has been a pioneer in social concerns; the successful consolidation of existing efforts dealing with the problems of mental retardation in the metropolitan area are but one example. Activities related to calling the attention of state and local legislators and other governmental powers to a number of community needs have made a formidable impression, and may continue to help solve many social problems.

The federation faces two major types of problems. First, the various individual and sectarian interests of agencies focusing on a particular social problem frequently lead to the agencies' incapability to see the problem in its larger context.

A considerable amount of the federation's energy is directed toward helping the general population and the various social agencies recognize the limitations of a provincial approach to solving problems. Second, funds for the activities of the federation are inadequate to meet the demands presented by the problems.

There is a degree of urgency, dedication and purposefulness in the manner in which the federation assesses its future. According to the director, considerable attention will be given to the development of a more effective means of using services in the community, to a concerted effort in the elimination of crime and delinquency, and to an increased involvement and responsibility of neighborhoods in recognizing and solving their problems. Expanded resources are needed to support such programs. Funds will be sought from existing channels and from increased support from state legislators.

Several general conclusions can be drawn from the investigation of selected cooperative efforts between the school system and other social agencies in the Space City metropolitan area. Almost without exception, those persons interviewed contended that the cooperative efforts are beneficial to both the participating institutions and the community.

A total of seven cooperative efforts were investigated. Four relate to cooperation between the city government and the schools, two to cooperation between the business-industrial community and the schools, and one to cooperation between the numerous community agencies and the schools. Of these, only the efforts in recreation, post-high school vocational education, and the federation of community agencies have a formal cooperative organization. The persons interviewed generally stated that the cooperative efforts in community relations, in school facility planning, and in high school vocational education are related to the high level of cooperation of the superintendent of schools with leaders of the business-industrial community and with the mayor. Two school administrators involved in the cooperative recreation program, which is formally organized, also cited the positive relationship between the mayor and the superintendent as a contributing factor to the recent increase in cooperative activities in the program.

Finally, while most of the activities in the seven cooperative efforts investigated are generally limited to the central city, some activities include the entire metropolitan area, and are under the domain of the federation of community agencies and the cooperative recreation efforts.

BORDER CITY: THE TRANSITION FROM SCHOOL TO WORK

Increasingly industrial? Yes! More and more jobs going begging? Yes! A higher unemployment rate among non-white adolescents than among the general population? Yes! Rising drop-out rates during times calling for more and more education? Yes!

All of these facts and many more were true of Border City. In the past, many of its high school students had little to look forward to except endless idle hours. Although it is too soon to pronounce complete success, a start has been made toward changing this picture as well as the prospects for students in at least four of its high schools. A "Job Placement Program" piloted in one high school in 1967-68 has now been expanded to three others in 1968-69.

Although the program is under the jurisdiction and direction of the public schools, the cooperation they have received from other agencies in the city has done much to ensure its success and continuation.

When asked how the program developed, one of the men responsible said, "It just seemed to develop from what we were already doing here in the city." Another said, "It was largely the result of considering some of our problems and what we might do to help solve them." Undoubtedly each of these statements is true. It is also quite plain that these men were given time to consider ideas, were encouraged to be creative in proposing solutions and that they were perceptive of the problems of today's city and its youth. These two men were encouraged to try something new and were given assistance, not only by their superiors, but by leaders of the business and industrial community. None of these factors is so unique to Border City that it could not be created elsewhere. Such factors are imperative, however, if new programs are to be born and flourish in any location.

For many years, Border City has been a participant in the various programs of vocational and technical education which are encouraged and supported by the state and federal governments. Some of these programs are of the cooperative type, in which students are placed, or place themselves, in part-time employment outside the school during a portion of their later years of formal schooling. As a part of these programs, teachers, coordinators, and vocational directors frequently found themselves placing and making recommendations for vocational graduates. In the process, they also discovered that there were more jobs available than there were vocational graduates and that many of the vocational graduates were overtrained for the positions which they were taking.

Some might say that it was natural that this stiuation would lead to the placement and recommendation of students not enrolled in the vocational and technical programs of the schools. Perhaps this is true, although such could be equally true in other schools with the same conditions, yet we find very few cases where similar things have been done.

Although it was probably the perception and diligent work of one or two men which got the program started, it is the cooperation they have received from many others which has assured its being and its success.

The job placement program got under way when a former vocational education coordinator was released from his responsibilities in that capacity and given full time to devote to assisting non-vocational graduates of one or Border City's high schools to find employment. Through the support of the local Chamber of Commerce and the help of a special committee formed by it, 98 per cent of all the boys and 75 per cent of the girls not going to college from that high school were placed in permanent jobs following their graduation in 1968.

Encouraged by this initial success in one school, the program has been expanded to three additional schools where the number of students to be placed at the close of the 1968-69 school year will be between 850 and 1,000 boys and girls. The original advisor has now been placed in charge of the over-all program and four new advisors named, one for each high school.

While most people would see job placement as the only goal for the program, its initiators really see it as accomplishing far more than that. "Our goals are three-fold: Communication, Motivation, and Job Placement," stated the original advisor and current head of the program. Communication is developed between the businessmen in the area surrounding each school, and the school community itself. These businessmen are encouraged to make their employment needs known to the school, and the students of the school, in turn, are assisted in making their abilities known to these and other businessmen in the community. The school becomes aware of the needs of the community and the business community learns the various abilities which exist among the schools' students. Knowing the needs of the business community, the school can adapt its program of studies and each of its students can realistically prepare himesle for eventual employment. Motivation is developed in students because there is now an actual benefit to graduate, even though a general curriculum is pursued. No longer does the student have to make a commitment to a life of one given kind of work at the age of 12, 13, or 14 by entering a vocational program in order to be assured that he will be assisted in finding employment at the time of graduation. The non-college bound student who is also non-vocational can now have the same freedom as the others in being able to utilize his entire secondary education and experience before making the decision as to his lifetime work. Job placement thus becomes a vehicle for encouraging education and for meeting the needs of the culture within which it exists, rather than functioning as an end unto itself.

The job placement program of Border City is, in practice, a three-part operation. One part is in the schools, another in the business community, and a third in the industrial sector.

In the schools, the program is under the direction of the Director of Vocational Education, and is coordinated by the Job Placement Coordinator and managed by the individual advisors in each of the high schools. The individual advisors are given the support of the local school administrators and are frequently given a hand by counselors, teachers, and vocational coordinators within the school.

In the business-industrial community, the central program is under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce, it is directed by the industrial department manager and is administered by a committee from the Chamber, headed by a major official of one of the larger businesses in the Border City area. The committee uses its membership, and that of the Chamber at large, to line up positions for the students in the city as a whole.

Within each of the local schools, an advisory committee of local businessmen, who do not have to be Chamber members, has been set up to acquaint students with the opportunities for employment which are available in their immediate area, and at the same time acquaint them with the expectations which will be held by their employers when they join the world of work. The advisory committee also assists the placement advisor in each school to bring about a more meaningful type of education in the school. This is done through discussions between businessmen, department heads, teachers and local administrators. During this type of discussion, the relevance of existing programs can be freely criticized and plans can be made to make the curriculum more appropriate for all youth, and especially those going directly into employment.

The job placement program, as currently constituted, places its main emphasis on the period immediately preceding and following June graduation. Seniors interested in securing employment are asked to complete placement, or application forms listing their academic majors and their work interests along with pertinent personal data. These forms are compiled into a brochure which is sent to 100 of the city's largest companies and is also made available to any other employer on request. At the same time, the Chamber of Commerce is sending questionnaires to employers in the city asking them to identify the number of job openings which they anticipate at graduation time and to give the duties, salaries, and qualifications for these jobs. Contacts are made directly by employers with students in many cases and in others the school assists, urges and even prods students to get together with appropriate employers.

During the remainder of the school year, and prior to the establishment of the borchure, each placement advisor has been engaged in counseling students on the process of securing employment, on how to fill out employment applications, how to dress for an interview, and even how and where to go to ask for a job. He has also been out in the field contacting prospective employers, following up previous referrals, contacting union officials regarding the possibility of joining their particular union or talking with coordinators of vocational education about positions requiring specific vocational skills for which the general student can not qualify.

The Chamber of Commerce is also busy trying to improve its possibilities for locating prospective positions. This is done through articles which appear in its own publications, in local newspapers (which have also been most cooperative), in a variety of meetings of the Chamber and of other groups, and through individual contacts by members of the special committee with other businessmen in the community.

Financially, resources for such programs may be available from a number of sources other than those from local operating funds and federal grants. Some of these sources may need only to be explored and developed by venturesome administrators.

Most businessmen see productive employment as the antithesis to an ever-expanding welfare burden and would be only too happy to lend their support to financing programs such as this one which would promote gainful employment from monies now being used for welfare payments. Although no administrator wants to lose his own position through its erosion, forward looking welfare directors are frequently willing to listen and to seek some of their finances to assist such programs as the one of job placement.

Other skeptics have suggested that this program is a duplication of the services of the State Employment Service, and as such, is not needed. Those from the schools and from the employment service in Border City who are involved in this program believe the two to be complementary to each other, and both as being necessary. They see the job placement program of the schools as being the medium for introducing youth to such agencies as employment services and they ~~see~~ the employment service as being an agency which furnishes a degree of expertise to the schools for aptitude testing and which later places the student. Through this type of cooperation each agency benefits; the school by reducing its operational expenses through the use of the available experience of the employment service, and the employment service by expanding public knowledge of its availability and operation.

Other sources of financing by schools thinking of developing such a program might be found by substituting these services for portions of the present guidance department, especially where some of these same functions are currently performed by that department. Others considering expansion of the guidance program might use this program instead of expansion without seriously curtailing service to all students.

Financially, one might say that such a program would be worthy regardless of what it costs, so long as it accomplishes what it is supposed to accomplish. As constituted in Border City, the program is not unduly expensive. Because it makes liberal use of outside resources, it uses other agencys' services where they may enhance the program and it uses a minimum number of additional professional and clerical personnel.

As the result of its success in pilot form, the Border City program was expanded four-fold after only one year. Even if the lower of the two percentages which were noted earlier is considered, the program must be deemed a success. This is especially true if one compares the number of graduates who were placed last year to the figures generally cited for similar cities without such a program.

The success of one year and the rapid expansion of the program should not be taken to mean that there have been no problems or that there are not plans for improving a program which is becoming established as a part of the schools' efforts to help their students.

One of the major concerns cited by school officials is the lack of follow-up study in placements to determine how many graduates remained in their original job and how many went on to a subsequent one. Another concern noted was a desire to extend to college-bound graduates a similar service for summer and part-time employment.

A further result of this experience is the recognition that it would be helpful if some sort of job readiness training could be provided for all graduates, and especially those who will avail themselves of the job placement program services. It has also been noted after the first year that there are a number of graduating students who are, at graduation, less than fully employable because of physical impairments previously unrecognized, untreated, or both. As a result of this discovery, contacts have been made with the Vocational Rehabilitation Service and this type of individual will now, and in the future, be involved in rehabilitation training to make him totally and permanently employable either at the time of, or shortly after, graduation.

What does the future hold for this program? No one would be so naive as to say that it holds the only promise for fulfilling the needs of youth in the transition from school to work; but indications are that it is a definite improvement over the previous situation. With continued success in the expanded program of the present year it is very likely that the service will be expanded to all high schools of Border City in the near future.

With the present and future experience, it is also likely that there will be internal changes in the program. As previously noted, plans are already well under way to expand the contacts of students with employers. Considerable thought is being given to the development of a series of experiences through which all employment-bound youth will develop a facility for coping with the exigencies of gaining and maintaining meaningful employment. These experiences will undoubtedly be included in the program of Border Bity in the near future.

It is hoped by both the schools and the Chamber of Commerce that similar opportunities may be offered both for part-time work for undergraduates and summer employment and part-time work for the college-bound students. The latter service would increase the opportunity for financially needy students to get a higher education in any of the professional, liberal arts, or technical areas.

As a result of this program, over the past two years many students have been employed who otherwise might not have, and instead who might easily have become indigents, dependent upon others for support. Instead of this, they are independent and are finding the self-satisfaction of being producing members of society. With the continued encouragement of the administration, the financial support of the Board of Education, and the excellent cooperation of the Chamber of Commerce, the youth of Border City are able to look forward to a better tomorrow.

Not revolutionary, but unique, this program could very well serve as the model for many cities within and outside the boundaries of Ohio. It already serves to show the opportunities which can be provided when various elements in a community cooperate to serve the needs of youth. To develop such a program, one need not follow exactly the same steps or pattern as that of Border City. (The description has been kept as general as possible in order to avoid this temptation.) Instead, it should be developed and tailored to fit the local situation. What is needed are educators who are genuinely concerned about the needs of all the community's youth and who are willing to try innovative means of education. Financial help can be found, and other help is available in every community for those who will take the initiative rather than hide behind tradition and excuses.

CENTRAL CITY: A COMMUNITY SCHOOL APPROACH TO EDUCATION

The community school is an aggregation of young and old people having as common interests learning, communicating, enjoying each other, and working out problems mutually. The community schools in Central City, Ohio are uniquely their own, with the emphasis being placed on requests by the community forming the essence of the program. This program reflects the warmth and the informality of the area and derives its basic support from the people, the agencies, and the schools of Central City.

The concept of community school for Central City started in 1956 with the president of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools, and the Curriculum Director. Having attended a Mott Foundation Conference in Flint, Michigan, they were intrigued by the possibilities of developing a similar schooling environment for their metropolitan area.

The metropolitan area of Central City is centralized with few outlying suburbs competing for both the human and economic resources of the center city. Central City technically meets the standards of being a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, but contains few of the problems which a person readily associates with the city. Central City is an industrial town, yet it has not been confronted with the in-migration and the exodus of various segments. Industry has not specialized.

During the early sixties, the embryonic program was largely conceptual with each of the participants reacting and sharing articles from the area of community schools. With the encouragement of the superintendent one of the high school principals achieved his doctoral degree through a Mott Foundation fellowship in the administration and superivision of community schools. He subsequently returned to Central City as an assistant superintendent. Another high school principal attended the community school director's training course offered again by the Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan.

A program of Lighted Study Centers was the first venture of Central City toward the community school concept. The program was supported by a Title I ESEA grant for $270, 000, and was designed to open two junior high schools and one elementary school during the evening hours. These schools, in the poverty areas of the city, opened the facilities of the libraries, recreational areas, and study centers for an increased segment of the area. Although approval was received to use these federal funds for many other activities within these schoosl, the limitations as outlined by federal regulations prevented the coordinator from developing these three schools into community schools. The true concept of community schools, as developed in Flint, Michigan, was more than libraries, recreation periods, and study centers for disadvantaged youth. It was instead a school after formal school hours in which the total community participated in any and all activities that they (the community) wanted.

The community school concept was further expanded in 1967 with the opening of three additional schools in the north, west, and east sections of the city. The Board of Education acted through the recommendation of the Assistant Superintendent by supporting through local finances and a $20, 000 grant from the Mott Foundation the expansion of the community school program.

Community response and petitions in 1968 brought about the opening of three additional community schools for a total of nine community schools in Central City.

The involvement of the citizens as well as the support of the agencies encouraged the Board of Education to support these schools as an integral part of their program. The experimental stage of the community schools is now drawing to a close.

The philosophy and objectives upon which the community schools of Central City are established are similar to those of the Mott Foundation. The basis of the community schools concept is that schools are established for all people and should reflect the needs and concerns of the people of the community.

The following excerpts are taken from the statement of philosophy and objectives accepted by the Central City Board of Education:

> "The community school meets the urgent needs of the people by utilizing everyone's help. It holds the promise that the welfare of the children and their families is its prime concern. It is the place where living and learning converge into meaningful contributions to society...The community school not only strives to teach pupils the basic curriculum, but also tries to help individuals with social activities and aid them in increasing or initiating their potential contributions to democracy. The school uses local community resources and works to create and improve community resources... It brings young people and adults together on matters of common concern, promoting and coordinating community action. It provides an adult education program and brings teachers more actively into community life.
>
> The objectives of the community schools are to fulfill needs in the community for recreation at all age levels, for academic enrichment courses, and for cultural and social needs of adult and senior citizen population. The schools are a center where members of the community practice democracy planning, developing, and sharing experiences ...It is the objective of the community school to improve existing community activities and develop new ones."

The organization of the community schools today reflects the dynamic interest and expansion of the program. The basis for much of the initial enthusiasm and generation of ideas has stemmed from the Assistant Superintendent and the Coordinator of Community Schools, both former high school principals and both participants in the Mott Institute. The responsibility of the coordinator is to ascertain the needs of the various neighborhoods served by the community schools and to translate these needs into programmic statements and activities. Each school theoretically should have a unique program, but similarities between the programs are significant. Another responsibility of the coordinator is the selection and supervision of directors for each of the community schools.

The directors serve as the head of each community school and also as afternoon physical education teachers for the elementary schools. Their responsibilities for the community school programs is to select and supervise the instructors of the late afternoon and evening programs, to occasionally teach a class themselves, to serve as partial liaison between the community and the school, and to further survey the needs of the neighborhood in the determination of potential program.

The instructors are drawn from the community, the schools, and industry, and bring their own area of expertise to the community school setting. These instructors are involved in such courses as: ballet, model building, yoga, modern math, sewing, basketball, slimnastics, badminton, volleyball, roller skating, arts and crafts, cake decorating, knitting, and bridge.

The operational expenditure of a community school is relatively small. The cost to double a school's use in Central City is estimated at $10, 000 a year. This amount includes the director's salary of $4, 200, additional custodial help at $2, 000, use of the building for $1, 000, and activity leaders and equipment at $2, 800.

Fees are charged for most activities to enable the schools to be self-supportive. The usual fee for ten hours of instruction is $2. 50, which is used to pay the instructors' salaries.

The statement that the schools have been self-supportive requires clarification. The six community schools established in 1968 and 1968 have been financed through local school funds, a $20, 000 grant from the Mott Foundation, a $1, 500 donation from the Sears Foundation, small donations from community industry and agencies, and fees charged for the various activities. The original three community schools are still financed by the federal grant. The actual financial cost of the community schools is also decreased by donated equipment and personnel services. Many of the teachers provide their services at no cost, and many business firms also supply free materials and equipment for the activities. In one school, for example, there are six practice organs donated to the community school. During the summer months the Fire Department fills the portable pools without cost, and the water department does not charge for the water. Without the support of the many community agencies, the school board would be forced to budget far greater revenues to the program.

With the Mott Foundation grant ending this year, the level of support by the local community must be increased, in the opinion of the coordinator of the community schools. The goal, as stated, is to make these schools fiscally self-supportive through the contributions of local agencies and the support of local tax millage. To bring about this situation, a one-mill tax levy will be requested for the support of the community schools. Central City voters will be confronted with the issue in the Spring of 1969.

"After I got to understand what the community school was all about, I liked it." This statement from one of the local citizens sums up the attitude of most who participate in the community schools. At first there was distrust by the local citizenry. Today, however, the attitude of the community is supportive. Citizens have realized that their taxes were not increased. (This may change, however). Members of parochial schools have used the community school and its facilities for which they pay taxes. The directors of the Y's and other recreational centers understand that the community schools did not replace their activities, but rather have increased the use of their facilities through cooperative agreements.

The attitude of the community is reflected in their participation in the community school programs. Each year there are four 10-week sessions during which about one hundred instructors conduct these activities for the nearly 1,000 adults, 1,500 secondary school students, and the 2,500 elementary children who participate.

The idea of community schools has become infectious. People are willing to canvass the community for signatures to petition the Board of Education for a community school in their area.

The good will generated between the people and the schools is the greatest benefit which the community schools have brought to the community, in the opinion of the coordinator of the program. Senior citizens see the school as a place to come to play bridge and pinochle rather than just a financial drain. The children and teens of Central City have found a place to get together for community activities. Many of the students have benefited from the academic enrichment programs, especially the reading program. The physical vigor of many citizens has been improved through the physical fitness programs. Many women have utilized the sewing and cake decorating classes. The smaller children have been "water-proofed" with the programs of free swimming lessons in the portable pools.

The economy of the city has also been improved by the community school program. Retail merchants have increased their business. Through the various activities in the schools, the business firms have been able to introduce the people to their merchandise by providing materials for the classes.

Industry has also benefited by the community schools. Many people have learned a salable skill or developed an interest in some trade through the various activities offered. The activities often cooperatively merge the interests of the individual with the needs of the industrial community.

The local governmental agencies have noted an increased civic pride on the part of the people. The police and fire departments receive much greater support now. In fact, there has even been an improvement in the attendance at political information programs since the beginning of community schools in the area.

People have gotten to know one another better, and this has helped them in their living together. Community schools have not solved the racial problem, but there are many white women who have gained new insights on race relationships by learning how to play bridge from a black instructor.

Just how good are the community schools? Everything stated thus far indicates they have been successful in Central City. Comprehensive evaluation is difficult, because of an inability to state concisely what makes a good community school and what makes a bad community school. The only evaluation that has been tried thus far is an evaluation of the number of participants. Of the 90, 000 citizens in the area there are between 10, 000 and 15, 000 who make use of the community schools each year.

At the presnt time Smith State University is preparing to do an in-depth evaluation study of the community schools in Central City. This will be the first detailed evaluation of the nine schools during their three-year existence. Some of the immediate questions with which the Smith State evaluation will be concerned are: Should the inner city school, which is the only school where trouble has broken out, be closed; (2) Should high schools be opened as community schools; (3) Should more schools be opened; and (4) What do the citizens want from the community schools ?

There are problems connected with the community school program. Perhaps the most serious problem at the present time is that of public relations. In talking with several citizens of the community it was learned that many people are now aware of the program. The directors stated that they do not have enough time to go knocking on doors to talk with the people. As a result not everyone is involved, and the needs of the community are not adequately known. The speeches, survey forms, circulars, and announcements about the community schools do not reach everyone. The directors generally agree that they have to spend more time visiting the homes around their school. Relieving the directors from afternoon in-school physical education classes may solve this problem.

Not only is there the problem of the people not having enough information, but also there is a lack of understanding on the part of the day school staff. Many principals and teachers feel the day school program and the night community school program are two separate entities. They do not see how the day school program fits into the community school. In some of the schools the working relationship between the director and the day school staff members needs much improvement. The community school suffers greatly when there is not the support of the day school staff members.

The present organizational structure of the program is very informal. If it were not for the Assistant Superintendent, the community schools would have many more problems than they do. In the very near future the organizational structure needs to be revised to bring together community schools, adult education, and summer programs under an Assistant Superintendent for Community Education.

Finding good directors is very difficult. Mature individuals are needed to coordinate interaction between the community and the staff. The working hours and the salary are not conducive to long tenure.

Connected with each school should be an advisory board, but at present these boards are too new to provide any leadership in identifying community problems.

There are also the day-to-day problems of supervising the activities; evening activities, at times, attract the trouble making elements of the community. Sometimes instructors are hard to find and the students are difficult to handle.

The future of the community schools in Central City hinges partly on the support of the voters in the upcoming tax levy. Further, the participation of the community is another factor which projects an optimistic outlook for the actualization and continued expansion of the concept.

The cooperation of the various agencies and the industries of the community indicates that the school has broken out from the parochial tradition of the schools in knowledge training the youth to the broader base of education - that of reflecting the needs and concerns of the entire community, and in this reflection, developing programs which meet these needs.

METROPOLIS: COOPERATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

In Ohio, one out of seven elementary and secondary students attend a non-public school. Last year, 382,252 students were enrolled in such a school, and of this number, 363,423 attended a Catholic non-public school. In recent years, the "Bus Bill" (Senate Bill 350), and the Highway Safety Act (House Bill 380), have necessitated interaction between the public and non-public schools. It is no longer conceivable that the two systems can operate in isolation from each other.

An exemplary program of cooperation between school districts in Ohio is found in the public-parochial school relationship in one of the metropolitan areas of the state. The two school systems are located in the central city of this metropolitan area. In this city, about 30 per cent of all elementary and secondary school children attend a parochial school.

The cooperation which presently exists between these two school systems began long before current legislation required participative efforts. The cooperation has now reached noteworthy proportions. There is considerable evidence of voluntary cooperation arising from a desire to maximize the use of local resources, and to provide for a harmonious relationship in the operation of the two school systems.

Three general areas of cooperative effort are easily identifiable. They are:

A. Voluntary cooperation which is purely local in nature, and exists chiefly at the administrative level.

B. Cooperation resulting from federal incentives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the National Defense Education Act, and the Education Professions Development Act.

C. "Mandated" cooperation under state legislation, such as the Bus Bill (Senate Bill 350), and the Highway Safety Act (House Bill 380).

Voluntary Cooperation

Chronologically, voluntary cooperation was the first to be developed. Over a period of two decades, administrative arrangements have gradually been established for the harmonious operation of both systems. These arrangements began without any specific long-range plans, and have developed in an additive, gradual manner. They emerged chiefly from the informal relationship between the superintendents of the two systems. Most of the procedures have been arranged at this level, rather than at the board level.

One factor which encouraged this type of cooperation was the size of the two systems. Since both were large, interaction was frequent. Another important factor was the centralization of the parochial school system. Before cooperation began, it had been only loosely organized, with a minimal amount of coordination. With centralization, however, it became a more identifiable and workable unit. Without this centralization, cooperative efforts would not have been possible. The procedures were common responses to mutual concerns, made as they arose. These responses took the form of policies, some of which follow.

Common Calendar. Not only the public and parochial schools in the city, but also those in the entire county, follow the same calendar. The immediate concern of the school administrators in arranging for a common calendar was to facilitate bus transportation. In this way, the busses operate only on a specific number of days. In addition, certain economic benefits are realized, since in many instances public and parochial children ride on the same bus. With different calendars, busses would have to operate every school day, even if only a few children were aboard. It was pointed out that the common calendar is also advantageous to those parents who have children in both systems. When the opening of school is questionable on a given day because of the weather, a joint decision is made by administrators of both systems regarding the opening of the schools.

Data Processing. This activity began as a Federally-funded program. When Federal funds were terminated, the schools began to finance the operation themselves. In this joint facility, grade reporting and scheduling are provided for the parochial schools. In addition, the public schools use data processing for student attendance and personnel records. The costs are pro-rated, with each system assuming its share.

Pupil Transfer Policy. This policy appears to be unique to just the public and parochial school systems. Aware that transfer within the school year is rarely advisable educationally, the school administrators have developed a transfer policy which has reduced the number of student transfers from one system to the other. Semester vacation and the month of September are "free transfer periods." At any other time of the school year, however, a parent must request transfer from his system's central office, and state his reasons. If permission is granted, it is sent in writing to the other system. This policy has eliminated many hasty transfers.

School Psychologist. This program, which has been in operation for many years, facilitates both parochial and public school students sharing the same school psychologists. The procedure calls for the central parochial office to refer children, through the public schools' Pupil Personnel Department, to the school psychologist. The program is funded exclusively by the public schools.

Home Instruction. If a parochial school child is a resident of the public school district, and is unable to attend classes for a long period of time due to illness, the public school provides him with instruction at home. The parochial school principal refers the matter initially to his central office, which then requests the service from the Pupil Personnel Department of the public schools. The teacher sent in such a case is an employee of the public school.

Visiting Teacher. School social workers are provided for children of both systems who may be experiencing home problems.

Special Education. The parochial schools have no facilities for the exceptional child. Whenever a parochial child is diagnosed as in need of some special classes, the school recommends transfer to the public school. If the child can be helped within the regular class, the public school special education program provides assistance to the pupil and the teacher.

In-Service Training of Teachers. In various areas of the city, public and parochial schools in a given neighborhood provide common in-service sessions for teachers of both systems.

Pupil Personnel Accounting. By law, the public school district must maintain a record of every child of school age in the district. A record must also be kept as to the school which he attends. The parochial school reports any of its students who have attendance problems to the public school which then takes necessary action.

Joint Student Activities. Both public and parochial high school students in the city have joined efforts to provide tutoring for elementary children who are culturally deprived. In addition, the students from all schools have a city-wide Student Congress, as well as their local student councils. They have also been cooperating for a long period of time in a joint concert program.

Salary Schedules. The public school salary scale is determined by the Board of Education. The parochial salary schedule is drawn up on that basis, with the parochial schools paying 95 per cent of the established public school salary schedule.

Planned Efforts. The two school systems have at least two cooperative efforts in the planning stage--educational television, and an enlarged data processing center.

Cooperation Resulting from Federal Incentives

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in 1965, the two school systems already had a long established working relationship with each other. With the federal funds available under ESEA, they moved further into cooperative endeavors for the mutual benefit of each. Since both systems have had financial problems, they moved quickly into this new area. Both immediately set up a director and staff for government projects. Since then, both directors have worked together so closely that one administrator commented, "They might as well put them both in the same building." The previous relationship between the two systems facilitated this new cooperative venture.

The school systems in question have taken advantage of many of the eight Titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They also have engaged in cooperative programs under the National Defense Education Act, and the Education Professions Development Act. For example, under a Title I grant (ESEA), the public and parochial systems are currently engaged in a remedial reading program for culturally disadvantaged youth. Any public school attendance area is considered a target area when the percentage of culturally disadvantaged children exceeds the city average of disadvantaged children, and it is then eligible for ESEA participation. Any parochial school located in an attendance area where the public school is eligible for aid, automatically becomes eligible for Elementary and Secondary Education Act benefits. In this case, reading centers are located in both public and parochial school buildings. In 1968-69, about 400 parochial school children and over 1,000 public school children participated in this reading program. Federal funds were used for the following purposes: materials, equipment, the centers, reading teachers, psychological services, health services, guidance services, speech and hearing therapists, visiting teachers, summer programs, and tutoring.

With a Title II grant, the parochial and public school systems have supplemented their library resources, and reduced the cost of basic and supplementary texts. Other printed and published materials may also be purchased under this Title. Once maintenance of effort, which amounts to the expenditure of one dollar per child per year on library resources, is established, a school system is normally considered eligible for Title II benefits. During the fiscal year 1968-1969, the parochial system studied received approximately $9,000 in Title II grants for library resources and supplementary texts. The public school district was the fiscal agent for the project.

A project deserving considerable commendation among the cooperative activities of the public-parochial systems is the development of an inner-city social studies curriculum. This project, funded by the Federal Government under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is focused on research and development directed toward the implementation of a curriculum in social studies, with emphasis on Afro-American needs and the needs of minority groups. One of the larger Ohio universities is the fiscal agent for the project.

The public and parochial systems have just received approval of a proposal under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III, for the funding of a project to develop facilities and a program for the identification, diagnosis, and remediation of the severely emotionally disturbed child. It is felt that elementary students who consistently manifest behavioral problems need specialized instruction, and that these students should be assigned to small special classes. The objectives of this project are to develop a diagnostic and demonstration program; to develop community awareness; to foster in-service and intern-development programs; to foster development of curriculum and curriculum materials; and to achieve eventual return to the regular classroom with adequate behavioral and academic functioning. There are no educational, health, or related resources available within the geographical area that could duplicate or approximate the services engendered within this project. The project calls for teachers, teacher-aides, nurses, speech therapists, pediatric services, neurological services, psychiatric services, and consultant services.

The National Defense Education Act, Title VI, provides for the psychological testing of parochial school children and is partially paid for by the Federal Government. Parochial schools are permitted to have one-half of their testing costs in grades three, six, and eight reimbursed from Federal funds. In the school systems studied, the public school system cooperates with the parochial school system in providing psychological testing.

The parochial and public school systems have engaged in a project to prepare teachers for inner-city and for other deprived school areas. Having received a grant of $290,000 under the Education Professions Development Act, the plan of the participants, which includes a university, two colleges, and two other school systems, is to provide twenty-two hours of a thirty-hour master's degree for 75 teachers who teach children of low income families. The emphasis of the program will be on the teaching of language arts and remedial reading to underprivileged children. The first summer session of this project will begin in June, 1969, with the school systems in this study each permitted twenty-five teachers per year, one-third of whom may be teachers of the parochial system.

"Mandated" Cooperation

Recent legislation at the state level has brought all public and parochial schools into a working relationship in the areas covered by such legislation. This legislation has taken three basic forms: the "Bus Bill" of 1965 (Senate Bill 350), and the Highway Safety Act (House Bill 380). The two school systems involved in this study naturally cooperate at this level as well.

Under the "Bus Bill," which is essentially directed toward providing transportation services for elementary school children, the public school system is compensated by the State for transportation services provided for parochial and public school children. These services must be provided according to State regulations at the elementary level; however, while the public school system sets the standard of service at the high school, it is obliged by law to provide comparable service to both public and parochial school students. Administrators of both systems work together to arrange appropriate bus routes, and the parochial schools handle disciplinary problems arising on the busses when these problems involve their students.

Under the Highway Safety Act (House Bill 380), public school systems are reimbursed by the State for providing driver education to both public and parochial school students. Although the parochial school has no control over this service, its students receive the same benefits as public school students. The two school systems under study have been fully utilizing these services, with the program being handled in, and from the child's own school building.

Senate Bill 350 has resulted in public and parochial school systems "sharing" a number of services. Under this bill, State funds are available for specific auxiliary services which may be provided to both public and parochial schools. The services, however, much be administered by the public school. State funds may be used for the following eight categories of services: guidance; programs for the emotionally disturbed; programs for the blind and deaf; educational television; remedial reading; speech and hearing programs; programs of non-basic instruction; audio-visual services; and programs for disadvantaged children. In this city, thirty-five persons under contract with the public schools give their services to parochial school students on a full-time basis, in implementing the auxiliary services provided for in Sentate Bill 350.

In conclusion, both public and parochial school administrators reported satisfaction with the relationship between the two systems. The two systems pursue different philosophies of education, and accordingly, both intend to maintain their own identify and autonomy. They have pursued cooperative programs exclusively in those areas where their goals are similar rather than different. From these activities in this particular city have come mutual understanding of each other's problems and programs, mutual support, increased harmony in operation, and optimal use of the resources available to each. In addition, they felt that though their philosophy is diverse, they were effecting a type of educational partnership. Although this group followed a different historical course, present State legislation which calls for public-parochial interaction may be the beginning point for others to establish similar cooperative arrangements.

CHAPTER V

SOME CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Today, the complexities of metropolitan existence strongly challenge the traditional political separatism of the American public school. At the same time, the vigorous and unprecedented demands that are being placed upon the public schools require them to look for new resources and sources of support as they seek solutions to problems that, too often, will not wait. It appears likely that these developments will ultimately result in modifications in the organizational and institutional relationships of the public schools.

This monograph has attempted to examine two types of organizational relationships which may offer the possibility of a partial solution to the problems which presently face central city schools in major metropolitan areas: increased cooperation among school systems themselves, and increased cooperation among school systems and other social systems. Throughout this study, the emphasis has been on an analysis of central city rather than suburban schools, and the data reflect the point of view of the central city superintendent, his staff, and selected municipal officials.

The relative isolation which has frequently characterized the relationship of the public schools to the political and social life of the nation is doubtless due in part to the historical classification of school districts as special districts in the governmental hierarchy. In spite of this statutory separatism, the dual themes of inter-school and inter-agency cooperation are not new. There is undoubtedly a long history of cooperation, formal and informal, inter-school and inter-agency, in a great number of school districts throughout the nation. This may be attributed in part to the professionalization of teachers and administrators as well as to the growing demands of the public for better schools. In addition, the liklihood that any segment of a major social system can remain aloof from its counterparts has been steadily diminished by the growing interdependence of modern society.

As Chapters I and II of this monograph suggest, however, there are diverse indications that these forces have not been sufficient to bring America's public schools to the level of performance that is expected -- and often demanded -- today. In recent year the Federal government has been especially active in encouraging programs which necessitate cooperative efforts among schools and other agencies. The Model Cities legisation and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in particular, require school districts to participate in planning and operating programs with other agencies in order to qualify for funding. Joint planning also characterizes much activity in special and vocational education. In Ohio, school transportation requirements mandate public school-private school inter-relationships.

Notwithstanding the fact that these developments would seem to justify the conclusion that inter-school and inter-agency cooperation are increasing, it is not possible -- given the present state of knowledge about these relationships -- to validate such a conclusion. In general, the literature reveals no comprehensive attempt to assess the state of inter-school or inter-agency cooperation in a given set of circumstances at a given time. Although specific accounts of a considerable number of cooperative endeavors are available, systematic treatment of these phenomena is lacking. Federal programs which involve fiscal accountability would appear to provide an initial base for further exploration. It must be recognized, however, that there is a wide array of cooperative activity which would not be included in this relatively limited category.

The patterns of cooperation which emerge from the survey of the nine Ohio central city school districts do seem to permit some tentative observations. Typically, inter-school and inter-agency cooperative relationships in these districts are informal. They are, ordinarily, not supported by formal board action or administrative directive. Cooperative relationships with other school systems and social agencies often reflect the personal and professional interests of the chief school administrator or of a small group of administrators, teachers, or citizens. As such, they often embody individual rather than institutional policy and program.

The five field reports have been presented as examples of relatively well-developed cooperative endeavors which are currently in existence in five of the nine Ohio central city school districts which were included in the survey. The individual survey teams investigated the origins of these programs, their objectives and methods of operation, and the depth of commitment to them as expressed in the application of personal and financial resources. These programs were designated as exemplary within the limits of this study; each one appeared to be the most effective of its type in the major Ohio central city school districts.

The major problems facing schools in metropolitan areas in Ohio and throughout the nation are obviously far from solution. Some would argue that these problems are, in fundamental form, still far from adequate recognition -- that they are the symptoms of broad and pervasive shifts in our social fabric that are as yet imperfectly described and comprehended. Whatever ultimate forms may emerge, it seems clear that new patterns of institutional response will be called forth. The central thesis of this monograph is that among these new patterns may well be included increased emphasis on the contribution to be made by inter-school and inter-agency cooperative endeavors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrook, Robert C. "Business Wrestles with Its Social Conscience," *Fortune* LXXVIII (August, 1968), pp. 88-90.

Alderson, J. J. "School Social Work and Education," *Illinois School Journal* XLVIII (Spring, 1968), pp. 16-24.

"Assistance for Intercultural Development," *Omaha Public Schools Bulletin*. (April 9, 1965).

Bacon, Warren. "School-Community Relations," *The People vs. The System*. Sol Tax, Editor. Chicago: Acme Press, Inc., 1968, pp. 166-169.

Bailey, Stephen K., Frost, Richard T., Marsh, Paul E., and Wood, Robert C. *Schoolmen and Politics*. (The Economics and Politics of Education Series, Volume I.) Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962.

Banfield, Edward C., and Wilson, James Q. *City Politics.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Baughman, M. D. "School's Role in Community Life," *School and Community* LI (October, 1964), pp. 9-10.

Beckman, Norman. "The Outlook for Cooperation in Metropolitan Areas," *Trends in Financing Public Education.* Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1965, pp. 202-213.

Bullush, Jewel, and Hausknecht, Murray, editors. *Urban Renewal: People, Politics and Planning.* New York: Anchor Books, 1967.

Bennion, Adam S., and Carr, William G. "A Report on the White House Conference on Education," *The Educational Trend* (December, 1955).

Benson, Charles S. *The Cheerful Prospect: A Statement on the Future of American Education.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.

_________ "The Economics of Education in Urban Society," *Phi Delta Kappan* XLVIII (March, 1967), pp. 316-319.

_________ *Education is Good Business*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators.

"Big City Survival Plan," *The American School Board Journal* XV (September, 1968), p. 15.

Bloom, Arnold M. "Three Men in a Tub," *American School and University* (July, 1966), p. 9.

Bollens, John C. *Special District Governments in the United States.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.

_________ "Metropolitan Districts," *Urban Government.* Edward C. Banfield, editor, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

_________ and Schmandt, Henry. *The Metropolis: Its People, Politics, and Economic Life*, New York: Harper and Row, 1965, p. 371.

Bourgeois, Donald. "Case Presentation: St. Louis," *The People vs. The System.* Sol Tax, editor. Chicago: Acme Press, Inc., 1968, pp. 416-420.

Brechler, Frederick Carl. "Patterns of School District Interrelationships: A Study of the Kansas City Metropolitan Area." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1966.

Brockman, N. "Catholic High School: Involvement and Commitment to the Urban Community," *National Catholic Education Association Bulletin* LXIII (August, 1966), pp. 210-18.

Burkhead, Jesse. *Public School Finance: Economics and Politics.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1964.

Budig, G. A. "Governmental Affairs Person in the Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan* XLIX (February, 1968), pp. 350-57.

"Business and the Cities: Who Does What," *Fortune* LXXVIII (August, 1968), p. 91.

Campbell, Roald F., Cunningham, Luvern L., and McPhee, Roderick F. *The Organization and Control of American Schools.* Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1965.

Chase, W. W. "Problems in Planning Urban School Facilities," *Association of School Business Officials Yearbook* L (1964), p. 237.

Chisholm, Leslie L. *School District Reorganization.* Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1957.

Clark, Kenneth B. *Alternative Public School Systems: A Response to America's Educational Emergency.* Washington, D.C.: United States Commission on Civil Rights, mimeographed, November, 1967.

_________ *Dark Ghetto.* New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Cobb, Mary. "Modern Technology Links Six Schools." *West Virginia School Journal.* (September, 1968), p. 14.

Coleman, James S. *Community Conflict.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Conant, James B. *Slums and Suburbs.* New York: Signet Books, 1961.

Counts, George S. *School and Society in Chicago.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1928.

Crosby, Muriel. "Everybody Gets Into the Act: Wilmington Schools and Other Agencies Work Together in Rapidly Changing Neighborhoods." *National Education Association Journal* LIV (November, 1965), pp. 22-24.

Crouch, Winston W. "Conflict and Co-operation Among Local Governments in the Metropolis," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.* Harry W. Reynolds, Jr., Editor. CCCLIX (May, 1965), pp. 60-71.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Equality of Opportunity: Is it Possible in Education?" *Administrator's Notebook.* XVI (November, 1967), pp. 1-4.

_________, Chairman. "Report on the Merger Issue," Unpublished report by a consultant team to the Louisville-Jefferson County, Kentucky Public Schools, 1966.

_________, Chairman. "A Report to the Columbus Board of Education," Recommendations of The Ohio State University Advisory Commission on Problems Facing the Columbus Public Schools, June, 1968.

Dahl, Robert A. *Who Governs?* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Eckstein, Otto. *Public Finance.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Education for the Future of Illinois. The Governor's Task Force on Education. Springfield, Illinois: The State Department of Education of Illinois, 1966.

Education for Pittsburgh. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for Field Studies, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1966.

Edwards, Newton, and Richey, Herman G. The Schools in the American Social Order. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.

Egerton, John and Leeson, Jim. "Nashville: Experiment in Urban School Consolidation," Phi Delta Kappan XLVIII (March, 1967), p. 323.

Emery, James. "School Districts Can Save Money," School Business Journal (September, 1967), p. 48.

Enactments by the 89th Congress Concerning Education and Training, Part I, 2nd Session, 1967, Prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare United States Senate.

Feirer, John. "Plans and Progress in Providing New Vocational-Technical Programs." Proceedings of the Ninth National Conference on School Finance. Committee on Educational Finance. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966.

Firman, William D. "Fiscal Independence of School Systems," Trends in Financing Public Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965, pp. 117-124.

Fischer, J. H. "Schools and Urban Planning," Ohio Schools XLVI (March, 1968), pp. 24-5.

________ "Tomorrow's Schools: Imperatives and Possibilities," Long Range Planning in School Finance. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1963, pp. 10-20.

Fitzwater, C. O. School District Reorganization: Policies and Procedures. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957.

Frieden, Bernard J., and Morris, Robert, editors. Urban Planning and Social Policy. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.

Gittell, Marilyn, Editor. Educating An Urban Population. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1967.

Goglia, R. M. "New Haven Turns to Year-round Community Schools," Nation's Schools LXXX (September, 1967), pp. 63-4.

Good, Carter V, Editor. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Goodykoontz, Bess. "Leader Not at Head of Table," from "Leadership in the Coordination of Social Agencies," Curriculum Journal XIII (October, 1942), pp. 257-60.

Government Structure, Organization and Planning in Metropolitan Areas. U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

Greer, Scott. The Emerging City. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

_________ Governing the Metropolis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Grieder, Calvin. "New Kinds of Intermediate Districts Are Showing Up." Nation's Schools LXXIX (May, 1967), p. 6.

Hadden, Jeffrey, Louis Masotti, and Calvin J. Larson, Editors. Metropolis in Crisis. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, Publishers, Inc., 1967.

Hamerman, S. and Vail, E. "Single Unit Approach to Urban Problems: Los Angeles Office of Urban Affairs," Phi Delta Kappan XLIX (April, 1968), pp. 453-57.

Hauser, Philip M. and Sehnore, Leo F. The Study of Urbanization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Big-City Education: A Cooperative Endeavor," Phi Delta Kappan XLVIII (March, 1967), pp. 320-322.

_________ "Challenge of Social Change to Education," Schoolmen's Week Proceedings University of Pennsylvania, LIII (1966), pp. 9-20.

_________ Education in Metropolitan Areas. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

_________ "How Big City and Suburban Schools Can Get Together," Nation's Schools LXXIV (September, 1964), pp. 60, 61, 86.

_________ Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education. The 67th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: The Society, 1968.

_________ "Planning Concepts and New Directions - Education," *The People vs. The System*. Sol Tax, Editor. Chicago: Acme Press, Inc., 1968.

_________ *The Public Schools of Chicago*. Chicago: The Board of Education of the City of Chicago, 1964.

Henry, Nelson B., and Derwin, Jerome G. *Schools and City Government: A Study of Municipal Relationships in Cities of 50,000 or More Population*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Hentoff, Nat. "Educators as Dropouts," *Evergreen Review* (November, 1966), p. 21.

Herman, Barry. "Winchester Community School: A Laboratory of Ideas." *Educational Leadership* XXV (January, 1968), pp. 341-343.

Hoffer, Eric. *The True Believer.* New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Holemon, Richard. "Federal Aid Causes New Alliances in Education," *The Teachers College Journal* XXXVII (January, 1966), p. 143.

Hughes, L. W. *An Investigation of Functional Components of Central Facilities Serving Educational Cooperatives and Intermediate School Districts.* Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee, 1968.

Hunter, Floyd. *Community Power Structure.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

_________ "Metropolitan Power," *The Reporter* (November 14, 1967).

Iannaccone, Lawrence. *Politics in Education.* New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1967.

Jacobson, Stanley. "When School People Get Together," *The National Elementary Principal* XLIV (May, 1965), p. 25.

James, H. Thomas. "Municipal Control of School Expenditures," *Proceedings of the Sixth National School Finance Conference.* Committee on Educational Finance. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966.

"John Lindsay's Ten Plagues," *Time* (November 1, 1968), pp. 20-23.

Johnson, Eugene I. *Metroplex Assembly: An Experiment in Community Education.* Brookline, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1965.

Kaplan, Howard B. Implementation of Program Change in Community Agencies. Houston, Texas: The Community Council, 1966.

Kean, Michael H. "Achieving Racial Integration in Urban Schools: An Approach," Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, mimeographed, 1968.

Keppel, Francis. The Necessary Revolution in American Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Kerber, August, and Bommarito, Barbara. The Schools and the Urban Crisis: A Book of Readings. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Kimbrough, Ralph B. Political Power and Educational Decision-Making. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1964.

Leu, Donald J., and Candoli, I. Carl. A Feasibility Study of the "Cultural-Educational Park" for Chicago. East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1968.

Levenson, William B., Editor. "Metropolitan School System Cooperation," Urban School Notes (January, 1967).

Lieberman, Myron. The Future of Public Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.

__________ and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Negotiations for Teachers. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.

Lobdell, Lawrence O. "Joint Board Meetings Help Four Districts Work As One," The Nation's Schools (December, 1965).

Logan, Richard F., and Jarvis, Ellis A. The Metropolitan Influences in Education. Los Angeles: University of California, 1963.

Long, Norton. The Polity. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1962.

Manvel, Allen D. "Implications of Intergovernmental Relations for Long Range Planning," Long-Range Planning in School Finance. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1963, pp. 122-128.

Martin, Roscoe C. Government and the Suburban School. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962.

__________ Metropolis in Transition: Local Government Adaptation to Changing Urban Needs. Washington: Housing and Home Finance Agency, 1963.

Mason, Robert E. "Decline and Crisis in Big-City Education," Phi Delta Kappan. XLVIII (March, 1967), pp. 306-310.

McGinnis, Harvard. "A Study of the Problems Invoked When a Local School District Merges with a City School District," Unpublished M.Ed. Report, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1958.

McGuiness, Lewis J. "The Role of the Public School in Organizing, Coordinating, and Financing Community Action Programs," Partnership in School Finance. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966, pp. 137-144.

Minar, David. "Community Politics and School Board," American School Board Journal CLIV (March, 1967), pp. 33-38.

Miner, Jerry. Social and Economic Factors in Spending for Public Education. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963.

Moffitt, J. C. "The Changing Scene Requires Cooperation," Citizen Cooperation for Better Public Schools. Fifty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The Society, 1954.

Morphet, Edgar L., and Jesser, David L. Cooperative Planning for Education in 1980. New York: Citation Press, 1968.

________ and Ryan, Charles O. Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education. Denver: Eight-State Project Office; Designing Education for the Future, 1967.

Morris, Robert, Binstock, Robert H., and Rein, Martin. Feasible Planning for Social Change. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Mumel, Allan D. "Implications of Intergovernmental Relations for Long-Range Planning." Proceedings of the Sixth National School Finance Conference. Committee on Educational Finance. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1963.

Mushkin, Selma J. "Education and Intergovernmental Relations." Proceedings of the Seventh National Conference on School Finance. Committee on Educational Finance. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964.

Nolte, Chester. School Administration in Metropolitan Areas. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966, p. 197.

Norton, John K. Changing Demands on Education and Their Fiscal Implications. Washington, D. C.: National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, 1963.

Nystrand, Raphael O., et. al. School-Community Relations in Four Cincinnati Neighborhoods: A Report to the Cincinnati School Survey, mimeographed, 1968.

Olsen, Edward, Editor. The School and Community Reader. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.

"One Hundred-Twenty-Seven Schools Lump Purchase Orders in County-Wide Program," Nation's Schools LXXVI (December, 1965), p. 44.

Pacesetters in Innovation: Fiscal Year 1967. Volume II. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968.

Parsons, Edgar Warner. "Cooperative Purchasing of School Supplies Under the California Standard School Supplies Law." Dissertation Abstracts XXV, Abstract Number 5694.

Performance of Urban Functions: Local and Areawide. Washington, D.C.: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1963.

Peters, C. C. "The School Among All the Agencies," from Foundations of Educational Sociology (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1924).

Phi Delta Kappan XLVIII (March, 1967), Entire Issue.

Prentice, Justus A. "A Cooperative Board Provides Regional Services," Educational Leadership XXIV (March, 1967), p. 551.

Profile of ESEA: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Project BRITE - Bridging Resources to Improve Teaching for Everyone. Saginaw, Michigan: School District of the City of Saginaw, 1968.

Project PURE - Project to Utilize Resources in Education. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, 1967.

Public School Survey and Recommendations of the Council for Re-organization of Ohio State Government, Columbus, Ohio: The Council, 1967.

Punke, Harold H. Community Uses of Public School Facilities. New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1951.

Purdy, Ralph D., Director. "A Master Plan for School District Reorganization in Ohio," Project Staff, School District Reorganization, The State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio: The Department, 1966.

__________, Director. "Planning for School District Reorganization," The Great Plains School District Organization Project (Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, South Dakota), Lincoln, Nebraska; 1968.

Ramsey, John L. "The Penta-County Story." Nation's Schools LXXIX (September, 1966), pp. 16-19.

Reissman, Leonard. The Urban Process, New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. New York: The New York Times Company, 1968.

Roberts, Wallace. "The Battle for Urban Schools," Saturday Review (November 16, 1968), pp. 97 ff.

Rodwin, Lloyd. The Future Metropolis. New York: George Braziller, 1961.

Rosenthal, Seymour, and Arnstein, George. "Where Schools Fit the Model Cities Program," Nation's Schools LXXX (September, 1967), pp. 59-65.

Rowland, Howard S., and Wing, Richard L. Federal Aid for Schools: 1967-68 Guide. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.

Rubin, Louis J. "Synergetics and the School," Teachers College Record LXVIII (November, 1966), p. 129.

The St. Louis Model City Voice, I (March, 1968).

Salinger, Harry. "All Year and Summer, Too," American Education IV (July-August, 1968), pp. 12-14.

Salisbury, Robert H. Planning for a Nation of Cities. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Sanders, Irwin T. The Community: An Introduction to a Social System. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1966.

School District Organization. Washington: Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association, 1962.

"Schools 'Scapegoat,' Teacher Group Says," The Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin October 20, 1968.

Schrag, Peter. Village School Downtown. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Sebastian, C. P. "Cooperative Projects Affecting Public Education in Great Cities," Dissertation Abstracts XXV, Abstract Number 6321.

Seeley, John. Crestwood Heights: A Study of the Culture of Suburban Life. New York: Science Editions, 1968.

Sexton, Patricia C. The American School: A Sociological Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

The Shape of Education for 1967-68. Washington: National School Public Relations Association, 1967.

Smith, E. B. "Cooperating Schools: Joint Responsibility," National Education Association Journal LVII (May, 1968), pp. 18-20.

Spergel, Herman. They Ride to School By Bus," American Education Journal (December, 1966), pp. 3-8.

A Statement in Support of the Cooperative Method of Organization. Chicago: The South Cook County Educational Development Cooperative, 1965.

Stein, Maurice R. The Eclipse of Community: An Interpretation of American Studies. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Stiles, Lindley J. Education in Urban Society. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1962.

The Superintendents Bulletin of the Omaha Public Schools, (April, 1965) Entire Issue.

Tiedt, Sidney. The Role of the Federal Government in Education. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Urban America: Goals and Problems. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Urban Education Bibliography. New York: The Center for Urban Education, 1968.

"Urban Education: The Big Push is On," Nation's Schools LXXX (September, 1967), pp. 61-65.

Usdan, Michael D. "Some Issues Confronting School Administrators in Large City School Systems," Educational Administration Quarterly III (Autumn, 1967), p. 228.

Walters, Robert L. "The Feasibility, Practicality, and Acceptability of Cooperative Action Among Ohio Independent Suburban School Districts," Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Education, The Ohio State University, 1960.

Williams, Oliver P., Herman, Harold, Liebman, Charles, and Dye, Thomas R. Suburban Differences and Metropolitan Policies. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965.

Wood, Robert C. "A Division of Powers in Metropolitan Areas," Area and Power. Arthur Maass, Editor. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959.

_________ 1400 Governments. Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1961.

_________ Metropolis Against Itself. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1959.

_________ "The Suburban Cooperative," Saturday Review (July 9, 1964).

Workman, David B., and Watt, Leroy R. "Boards, Systems Can Save Money If They Want To," The American School Board Journal (April,1966), p. 10.

Zimmer, Basil, and Hawley, Amos. "Factors Associated with Resistance to the Organization of Metropolitan Area Schools," Sociology of Education XL (Fall, 1967), p. 347.

Zimmerman, Joseph, Editor. 1968 Metropolitan Area Annual. Albany, New York: Graduate School of Public Affairs, State University of New York at Albany, 1968.